A VINDICATION

OF THE

PRINCIPLES and CHARACTER

OF THE

PRESBYTERIANS

OF

IRELAND.

Addreſſed to the BISHOP of CLOYNE,

In Anſwer to his Book, entitled,

The Preſent STATE of the CHURCH of IRELAND.

THE THIRD EDITION.

By WILLIAM CAMPBELL, D. D.
MINISTER OF ARMAGH.

Iſta quidem ratione fateor, bene conſultum rebus eorum qui dignitate pollent —— Cæterum lubens audiam rationem, qua conſulatur et TOTULE vel libertati, vel commodis.

ERASM.

The Proteſtant Religion is the *Child* of the Conſtitution—the Preſbyterian is the *Father*,—the Roman Catholick is not an Enemy to it. The political principles of Preſbyterians, I prefer before all others.

Speech of an illuſtrious COMMONER.

LONDON:
Printed for T. EVANS, Paternoſter-Row.

M.DCC.LXXXVII.

A

VINDICATION

OF THE

PRINCIPLES AND CHARACTER

OF THE

PRESBYTERIANS OF IRELAND.

My Lord,

THE repreſentation you have given of the Church of Ireland is very alarming. Her ſituation is full of diſtreſs, and, as you alledge, ſhe is on the brink of deſtruction. At other periods, High Churchmen have thought it uſeful

to raiſe a cry that the *Church* was in danger, when they only aimed at ſerving their intereſt or ambition, or gratifying their love of perſecution. But you are more generous than theſe men; you extend your views to the State; your country has a great ſhare of your concern; you have ſounded the alarm, as you tell us, and wiſh to rouſe the attention of Government to the ſafety of *Church and State*, as, in your opinion it ſhould ſeem, they had been too remiſs, and their exertions too feeble for the greatneſs of the occaſion. Now, if indeed the evil be thus preſſing, if there be the moſt urgent neceſſity for Proteſtants of every denomination to unite their ſtrength in ſupport of our admired conſtitution, where was the prudence of an unprovoked attack upon the whole body of Preſbyterians? Was it prudent to hold out to the world, that the Proteſtants of Ireland were not intimately united in ſupport of the conſtitution? Is it thus you would ſtrengthen the hands of Government? And, at a moment ſo awful and critical in your apprehenſion, could it be imagined that wiſdom ſhould dictate the expedience of repreſenting the Preſbyterians, who form the great body of Proteſtants in this kingdom, and who conſequently form the great *natural* ſtrength of our Proteſtant Government, as *a "body of men who cannot be entitled to national confidence"**?" You ought, my Lord, before you brought ſuch a charge, to have been better acquainted with their principles and conduct. Had you been better acquainted with their hiſtory, you would have known that, from their firſt eſtabliſhment in this country, they had rendered the moſt impor-

* p. 19—Third Edition.

tant

tant ſervices to Government; that for near two centuries in the moſt difficult and trying times, and in the moſt dreadful convulſions of the State, their conduct had been uniform and ſteady in ſupport of the Conſtitution, when ſome members of your Church, and not a few, were more than ſuſpected by Government, as we ſhall ſee hereafter. When you conſider theſe facts with attention, you will perhaps find reaſon to change your opinion, and to find the principle is merely fanciful, dictated by your fears or by prejudice, that the members of the "eſtabliſhed Church, *alone*, "can be cordial friends to the entire conſtitution "of this realm, with perfect conſiſtency of prin-"ciple."

The charge you have brought againſt Proteſtant Diſſenters is not founded on any part of their conduct as ſubjects of the realm. You have not mentioned, and, I truſt, you will not be able to mention any action of theirs of a public nature, that will not redound to their honour. The charge is founded on opinion, and therefore may be called fanciful, or the child of prejudice, and, in our judgment, is not ſupported by your arguments, and the authorities you have adduced, either of ancient or modern times. Let us go on to examine it with that reſpect which is due to your extenſive learning and knowledge of the world, and ſtill more with a ſacred regard to truth—to the intereſt of our country, and the vindication of Preſbyterians from the injurious repreſentation you have given of their principles.

The eſtabliſhed Church you conſider "in a "point of view merely political, and you propoſe

" to prove that it is ſo *eſſentially* incorporated " with the State, that the ſubverſion of the one " muſt neceſſarily overthrow the other*." To enable your readers and yourſelf to judge whether this principle be founded on truth or be merely fanciful, it would have been neceſſary to deſcribe the nature of this eccleſiaſtical polity, which you would advance thus highly—to point out its extent and limits, and to ſhew thoſe important effects it is neceſſarily fitted to produce, and without which our civil conſtitution cannot exiſt. But inſtead of giving any diſtinct view of the queſtion, you think it better to uſe general, undefined terms, and truſt to ſtrong aſſertions, on a ſubject avowedly of great importance, where the fancy has been accuſtomed to indulge certain implicit notions without inquiry. This is the true field for declamation, and you have choſen your ground well, from whence to ſound an alarm. The deluſion, perhaps, might vaniſh if you attempted to deſcribe the eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment in a political view, and to inform us how, and by what power it gave ſtrength and ſtability to the State. We know that there are two Houſes of Convocation; that the Biſhops have a ſeat in the Houſe of Lords, and that they are poſſeſſed of great revenues; that there are different degrees of dignities in the Church; and that courts and viſitations are held in the name of the Biſhops, wherein Laymen often preſide.

Now, in what part of this political eſtabliſhment are we to look for the ſupport of the State? The Houſes of Convocation have not, even, the

* page 6.

ſhadow

ſhadow of power. They have neither legiſlative nor judicial authority---and their meetings did not contribute either to the ſtrength of the empire, or to the honour of the clerical character, as appears particularly by their conduct in the reign of Charles I. and in the reign of Queen Anne. Their ſittings therefore are wiſely diſcontinued, as in no ſort eſſential to Church or State.

Is it on the Bench of Biſhops in the Houſe of Lords, that we are to look for this powerful ſupport of our juſtly-admired conſtitution? But our parliamentary hiſtory will not authorize your aſſertion that they are eſſential to a free State. If you ſay, they have been zealous ſupporters of the Crown, it will be acknowledged that they have been ſo much the devoted ſervants of it, as to bring our admired conſtitution well nigh to deſtruction. The temporal Peers, the *hereditary* counſellors of the Crown, have authority and dignity ſufficient to give that conſtitutional ſupport to the Throne, which is eſſential to maintain the balance of the State.

It will ſcarcely be alledged that the Biſhops Courts are an eſſential part of the conſtitution, or that the inferior Clergy in a *political* view are more uſeful than other good ſubjects.

But perhaps it may be ſaid, that it is the combination of theſe ſeveral parts that conſtitutes this eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment ſo eſſential to the State. And here you are called upon to explain this combination, and ſhew, how it is entitled to that political importance, to which you would exalt it in our conſtitution. Until you do this, you will

excuſe us for aſſenting that *your* particular eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment, or any other particular eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment, is not *eſſential* to our conſtitution.

Where the eccleſiaſtical authority is lodged in the church of England, ſeems as little determined, as the ſeat of infallibility in the church of Rome: For, not to mention the famous debate between *Hoadley* and *Sherlock*, we find *Parker*, Biſhop of Oxford, aſſerting, the King was ſuperior to Chriſt; But *Cozens*, dean of Peterborough aſſerts, that he had no eccleſiaſtical authority; whereas, by ſtatute, all eccleſiaſtical power is aſſerted to the Crown; all authority of juriſdiction, ſpiritual and temporal, is derived from the King's Majeſty, as ſupreme head of the churches and realms of England and Ireland. Epiſcopal juriſdiction may be veſted in laymen by the Crown, by the ſtatute 31 Hen. VIII. c. 12. § 23. This ſtatute was repealed the firſt and ſecond of Phil. and Mary; and this of Phil. and Mary was repealed in this matter, 1 Eliz. c. 1. ſo that eccleſiaſtical juriſdiction in lay hands ſtands to this day on the foot of 31 Hen. VIII*. The opinions therefore of churchmen are at variance with the laws of the land.

Nor is it eaſy to underſtand what you mean by an "eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment, conſidered in a "view merely political." Do you mean that we ſhould exclude from it every idea of religion? But ſuch abſtract notions, if they could be formed, only lead to perplex and involve the ſubject; and there is the more reaſon to be explicit on this part of

* Examinat. of the Codex Jur. Eccl. Anglic. p. 16—23.

your

your argument, becauſe the only utility of eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhments that you have pointed out, is not of a political, but of a religious or moral kind, —it is, " inſtructing the people in their duty, as " men and citizens: The impoſſibility of fixing " morality on a broad, or indeed on any ſure baſis, " but that of religion; the neceſſity of eſtabliſhing " in the mind of the ſubject, an internal principle, " as a collateral aid to the check of the law,"--- and for this you adduce the " authority of Chriſ- " tendom, ſince the days of Conſtantine*."

Theſe are effects of Chriſtianity truly excellent. But will it be ſaid, that theſe effects are confined to political eſtabliſhments, and that they have not been produced by teachers of religion in every age, who were not members of any eſtabliſhment? The early teachers of Chriſtianity did thus fix morality on the baſis of religion, and they were diſſenters from the eſtabliſhed church. The Proteſtant diſſenting miniſters in England, and the Preſbyterians in Ireland, it is preſumed, are equally diligent in inſtructing the people, under their paſtoral care, in their duty as men and citizens, with the miniſters of the eſtabliſhed church. But all eſtabliſhed churches are not thus diligent; for at this day, in many of them abroad, teaching is ſeldom uſed; and in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, teaching was little encouraged at home: it was neceſſary for the clergy to take licences for preaching, and theſe were granted ſparingly. It is, no doubt, the wiſdom of every government to encourage practical religion, which is more eſſential to the happineſs of a ſtate than eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhments, conſi-

* P 5

 dered

dered in a view 'merely political.' And here it may not be improper to lay before you the judgment of a divine of the eſtabliſhed church: "If "we would but open our eyes, we ſhould ſee that "we are beholden to the Diſſenters for the conti-"nuance of a great part of our theological princi-"ples; for if the high-churchmen had no checks, "they would have brought in Popery before this "time, by their over-valuing pomp and cere-"mony in divine worſhip. So that if there had "been no Diſſenters, the Church of England had "been long ſince ruined.*."

You ſay, "That almoſt every legiſlature (in "Europe) has adopted an eccleſiaſtical polity, "conformable to the genius of the civil conſti-"tution†."

When Conſtantine came to the throne, he found the Chriſtian Church governed by a power derived from the ſacred founder of it, and not from any civil authority. This has been called the *inherent* power of the church; and the Emperor was ſo far from encroaching on this power, or ſuperſeding it by his imperial edict, that he ſupported it, and earneſtly exhorted the Church to continue the exerciſe of it. He appointed, indeed, by law, church revenues to be paid out of the revenues of every city. Large donations were made to ſome churches; but many of the biſhops were poor, and ſome biſhops were obliged to follow trades‡. The influence that a few of them might have in public affairs, was due to the perſonal favour of the Emperor, But in his eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment, if you

* Dr. Edwards's Preacher, Vol. II. p. 133. † p. 9.
‡ Sozom. Hiſt. Eccl. p. 567. 600. 749. 752.

will

will allow it the name, he did not raiſe the biſhops to any civil power; he did not raiſe them to be members of the legiſlature; he did not create them ſenators or members of his council*; and, what is to our purpoſe, if tithes be an eſſential ingredient of an eſtabliſhed church, he gave them none; nor did he nominate to vacant biſhopricks. The election of biſhops or paſtors was in the people, and had been ſo from the beginning of Chriſtianity, as it is practiſed to day by the Preſbyterians of this kingdom. The Emperor writes to certain churches, "that the election was in their power, and depend-"ed on their judgment—and ſhould be made ac-"cording to the rule of the church, and the tradi-"tion of the Apoſtles†." Was this an eſtabliſhment ſimilar to the abſolute government of the empire? Or was it the *independent* principle, or government in a civil view, which you charge as a fault againſt Preſbyterians‡? This independent or inherent power continued long in the church, after the empire became Chriſtian. Ambroſe was choſen biſhop of Milan by the people, when he was governor of that city, and upon his election he demitted his government. Was this the *levelling* principle of the Preſbyterian church, which you ſay, was adopted by republicks§? This I aſk, becauſe you do not explain what you mean by it. It certainly ſhews an *independent* power in the church, not as to any civil matters, for in theſe they were, and ought to be, ſubject to the State, but as to things merely religious; and that it was her opinion, that biſhops ought not to be entangled with civil affairs, but that they ſhould devote themſelves entirely to the miniſterial office. Con-

* Epiſcopatus eſt nomen operis, non honoris. Auguſt. Civ. Dei. l. 19.

† Euſeb. de Vita Conſtant. l. III. Theod. l. I. c. 20.

‡ p. 19. § p. 10.

Conſtantine, and the Emperors that ſucceeded him, had no idea of being heads of the church, in the ſenſe that it is now uſed; nor did they think that any ſort of eccleſiaſtical power was derived from that ſource to the paſtors of the church. The notion of an "eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment in a point "of view merely political," which has given riſe in modern times to the faſhionable phrafe of *Church and State*, was unknown to Conſtantine: ſo that the church government under this deſpotic prince, was not, "conformable to the genius of the civil "conſtitution." In your church, all eccleſiaſtical authority is derived to you from the Crown. Hence it was, that the Council of Nice, though convened by Conſtantine, did not look up to him for power to judge in the caſe of Arius; they decided by their own authority. But an Engliſh convocation could not thus decide in the caſe of Whiſton. The deciſion of hereſy was in the Queen; ſhe was ſilent; and the convocation dared not pronounce ſentence, for fear of incurring a *præmunire*.

Neither was the "eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment ſo "incorporated with the ſtate, that the ſubverſion "of the one muſt neceſſarily have involved the "overthrow of the other."—Conſtantine ſupported, or, if you will, eſtabliſhed one ſect; his immediate ſucceſſor ſupported an oppoſite ſect; and Julian ſubverted them both, and eſtabliſhed, ſtrictly ſpeaking, the Heathen temple inſtead of the Chriſtian church. But theſe changes were ſo far from neceſſarily involving the overthrow of the civil government, that it made not the ſmalleſt alteration. And it was this Julian, branded with the name of Apoſtate, perhaps improperly, that has furniſhed the model of religious eſtabliſhments, and it is to him

him we are to refer them rather than to Conſtantine; at leaſt the model of this hated Apoſtate has been faithfully attended to by certain Chriſtian eſtabliſhments; and ſome, who arrogate to themſelves high claims of excellence and perfection, have not been aſhamed to imitate his laws. I ſhall therefore mention two or three of his laws, as it may gratify thoſe that are curious in ſuch reſearches: He had his *teſt act*, by which all that were appointed to places in the government, or army, were obliged to *qualify*, by attending the ſervice of the Heathen Temples, and offering ſacrifices to idols. —2. He enacted a law, prohibiting Chriſtians from having a liberal education—that they might not be able to defend their religion againſt the philoſophers, and that thereby it might fall into contempt. —3. He impoſed extraordinary taxes on Chriſtians for being diſſenters from the national eſtabliſhment, ſimilar to a double land tax.—They that are deſirous of ſeeing the whole of his ſyſtem, will find it in the hiſtorians of that period*.

But, as the eccleſiaſtical policy, introduced by Conſtantine, gave no new ſtrength or ſtability to the empire, ſo neither did it produce the other good effects, which you ſuppoſe to reſult from religious eſtabliſhments, and in your opinion evince the propriety of them. The Chriſtian church had recommended itſelf to the world by the virtues and amiable character of its members for ſeveral centuries, whilſt they were either neglected or perſecuted by the reigning Emperors. But the virtues, that ſo much diſtinguiſhed them in adverſity, ſeemed

* Socrat. Eccl. Hiſt. p. 184. & ſeq. Sozom. Hiſt. Eccl. p. 623.

to

to have very quickly disappeared, when they were advanced to riches, and the favour of a court. Instead of instructing the people in their duty as men and citizens, the bishops neglected their own, and became factious, turbulent, seditious. So that Constantine quickly felt the dire effects of his ecclesiastical policy, and bitterly complains of their hatred and variance, and their doing every thing for the destruction of the human race*. This first instance, then, would seem to overturn your principle rather than confirm it, and plainly points it out to be the wisdom of government to support men in the free exercise of their religion, and not establish any political institution of it.

His successor had equal reason to complain of the assuming and arrogant temper of his prelates, and among these none is more distinguished than St. Athanasius. He partook of all the priestly domination which, in succeeding ages, was so remarkable in the Church of Rome, and displayed itself throughout all the nations of Europe, and particularly in England, with no small violence. If the character of St. Athanasius be contrasted with that of the most haughty Popish Prelate known in the history of England, and be found to bear a striking resemblance, may it not strengthen our conclusion, that to raise ecclesiastics to great eminence and power did not tend to promote the peace either of the Empire or of Britain?

Every one, acquainted with church history, knows that few names have enjoyed a greater portion of fame as champions for their order than

* Sozom. p. 488, 492.

St.

St. Athanaſius and St. Thomas à Becket.—They not only partake of the general likeneſs of character derived from the order, but are conſpicuous among their brethren for a double portion of the ſpirit of it; and in the circumſtances of their fortunes there is a remarkable ſimilitude alſo, as well as in their manners and characters.

They were both early poſſeſſed of high reputation, and attracted the public attention — they were both raiſed to the higheſt epiſcopal dignity in their country; the one in Egypt, the other in England — they were both deeply infected with the ſpirit of bigotry and prieſtly domination, which led them into perpetual ſcenes of ſtrife and variance — they both had the misfortune to be publicly accuſed of peculation; the one as chancellor, the other as guardian of a charity for ſupport of widows and orphans. Athanaſius, however, had zealous apologiſts, who confidently deny the charge. They both gave occaſion to the calling of councils to ſit in judgment upon their conduct: and the judgment of the Council of Tyre was unfriendly to Athanaſius, as the *conſtitutions of Clarendon* were to Becket: So that they both fled into baniſhment, having embroiled their country in diſtreſs and calamity.

To misfortunes and baniſhment, it is ſaid, we owe ſome of the moſt exalted characters among the philoſophers and poets, who were the ornaments of antiquity. But theſe *holy* men ſeem not to have profited by their misfortunes—they learned no wiſdom — they acquired no virtues — they were perſuaded they had already attained perfection: and in this perſuaſion, they both maintained that

that their cauſe was the cauſe of Chriſt and of his church; and thouſands believed them, or affected to believe them. Becket thought Chriſtianity conſiſted in prieſtly dominion—Athanaſius in the vain queſtions of a vain philoſophy. Therefore inſtead of the law of kindneſs; inſtead of that divine temper which ſuffereth long and is kind; inſtead of that gentleneſs, which is eaſy to be entreated, and which leads us to prefer others in honour to ourſelves—theſe prelates were filled with ſtrife and variance and the bittereſt contention. No wonder, then, their conduct was marked with none of thoſe graces that adorn the Chriſtian character, and that ought to diſtinguiſh the Chriſtian Biſhop. Inſtead of learning wiſdom in the ſchool of adverſity, their minds ſat brooding over their loſt power and dignity; inſtead of learning humility, as became their profeſſion, their hearts were ſolely bent on recovering their former rank and eminence. To this end, they were reſtleſs, indefatigable, fruitful in expedients; and their expedients partook of the character of the men, dexterous and cunning, but at the ſame time daring, violent, and full of revenge. They inveighed againſt their ſovereigns with bitterneſs and acrimony—they treated their names with contempt—they repreſented them as impious and profane, enemies to religion and the church; and ſucceeded but too well in rendering them hated and vile, and contemptible among the nations where they ſojourned, and to many of their own ſubjects.

They, therefore, both met with very powerful protection; it may be ſaid, from the ſame quarter. The Pope of Rome ſupported them both with all his

his weight and authority: by which, along with their own reſtleſs ambition, they procured ſuch power, as enabled them in a very threatening tone to denounce vengeance againſt their ſovereigns. Conſtantine, Emperor of the Weſt, was induced to declare war againſt Conſtantius his brother, if he did not reſtore Athanaſius. And we do not find that the *Saint* had any reluctance to engage two brothers in a civil war, and to deluge his country in blood, that he might triumph over his adverſaries in angry diſpute—but Conſtantius thought it moſt diſhonourable to engage in war, and with a brother, for the quarrel of a factious, wrangling prieſt.

Becket had equal ſucceſs in his intrigues with the king of France; and by his aſſiſtance and the ſpiritual arms of the church, he obliged Henry II. powerful as he was, to deſcend to a treaty with a rebel ſubject, and even ſubmit to be inſulted by him.

Thus were thoſe illuſtrious prelates reſtored in ſpite of their ſovereigns; and, as might be expected, returned home more haughty and arrogant than ever. Athanaſius confronts his emperor, and meets him as it would ſeem, on more than equal terms—then continues his proceſſion through the provinces with a triumphant ſort of inſolence—foments the ſpirit of diſcord—and marks his progreſs with faction, preſumption, and arrogance; for all which he was accuſed and condemned, and this turbulent high prieſt was a ſecond time ſent into baniſhment.

Becket returned equally triumphant through

the ſtreets of London, and equally ſwelled with pride and inſolence, which at length became ſo inſupportable, that this arrogant prelate was miſerably ſlain.

Their fame after death has been great but various—Becket was admired, revered, adored by the Chriſtian or Anti-chriſtian world. His ſhrine was viſited with uncommon devotion for ages, even down to the Reformation.—An ingenious writer of that time hath, with much humour, given us a very lively picture of the pilgrimages and devotions paid at Becket's tomb, and the lucrative traffick carried on at his ſhrine*.

During that period, Becket's fame far outſhone that of Athanaſius: but at the Reformation it was eclipſed, and ſet to riſe no more.—Athanaſius's, though not ſo ſplendid, has been more laſting, and has ſurvived the Reformation, though it might have been expected that it would have ſunk into equal obſcurity and darkneſs.

Their fame, in certain reſpects, was equally unmerited—Becket was revered for virtues he did not poſſeſs—Athanaſius for a creed he never ſaw; and both were introduced into the kalendar of Saints.

Such were theſe champions and confeſſors, or martyrs for the church, and for orthodoxy—Men, whoſe forbidding, ungainly characters were formed after the model of the Heathen prieſthood of their reſpective countries, famed for their intole-

* Eraſmus.

rance,

rance, bigotry, and religious fury.*—The Egyptian ſaint had his full ſhare of the factious, wrangling, turbulent ſpirit of his countrymen; as the Engliſh ſaint had of the gloomy, cruel, unrelenting ſuperſtition of the ancient Druids.—This is the unhallowed ſource to which we ſhould trace the uninterrupted ſucceſſion of the hierarchy: for ſuch is the origin of dioceſan prelacy—an order the moſt oppoſite imaginable to the purity, the ſimplicity, and true dignity of the chriſtian biſhop.†

It were eaſy to adduce many other inſtances from this firſt eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment (to which you refer us), to ſhew, that it did not tend to the ſtability or peace of the empire, but, "conſidered "in a point of view merely political," was ſubverſive of the publick peace and happineſs. Saint Chryſoſtom, by his intolerance and bigotry, and by his inſufferable inſolence and perſonal abuſe, not only diſguſted ſome of the chief nobility, and higheſt officers of the ſtate, but by his influence in Conſtantinople, of which he was patriarch, involved his country in a dreadful civil war, and was himſelf at length driven into baniſhment, where meeting with no ſuch powerful protectors, as thoſe of Athanaſius and Becket, to involve his

C country

* Cæſar de Bello Gall. L. VI. Moſheim. Hiſt. Eccl. Bower's Hiſt. of the Popes. Diodor. Sicul. lib. II. c. IV. Juvenal. Sat. 15.

——— Summus utrinque
Inde furor vulgo, quod numina vicinorum
Odit uterque locus: Cum ſolus credat habendos
Eſſe Deos, quos ipſe colit———

† Socrat. Hiſt. Eccl. lib. II. c. 23. 24. 26. Sozom. Hiſt. Eccl. lib. III. c. 20. p. 532. 546. Epitome Philoſtorgii Hiſt. Eccl. a Photio, p. 485. Rapin's Hiſt. of England. Lord Lyttleton's Hiſt. of Hen. II.

country again in calamity, he ſunk under the diſgrace he ſo well deſerved, and there ended his reſtleſs life.*

We might mention a character of an illuſtrious prelate,† in an eſtabliſhed church very nearly connected with ours, that bears a ſtriking reſemblance of this laſt. But church hiſtory furniſhes a thouſand inſtances: they abound under the emperors of Greece and Rome, as well as under the kings of England. Theſe are the eccleſiaſticks, who have been revered while living, and whoſe memories have been treated with the moſt diſtinguiſhed honours by their brethren in every ſucceeding age. And it is they whoſe names have furniſhed out the long liſt of Saints to the kalendar of the church, whilſt the humble and peaceful ſervant of his God is unnoticed and forgotten.

Thus in the decline of the Roman empire was laid the foundation of church power, which was brought to its ſummit in the papal hierarchy. In this hierarchy, you ſay, "deſpotick ſtates have "found—a congenial ſyſtem of arbitrary domini-"on." But the Engliſh hierarchy, from whence our eſtabliſhment was copied, is friendly to civil liberty—How does this appear, and where ſhall we ſearch for proof? is it in political diſcuſſion, or in hiſtorical deduction? But here we are at a loſs, even at our entering on the ſubject; for you have not told us what you underſtand by the church of England. Is its *political* conſtitution the ſame now as it was before the Reformation? or is it different? One of her prelates has told us, that the church of England

* Theodorit. Hiſt. Eccl. l. V. c. 32. Sozom. p. 761. 767.

† Laud.

England is an equivocal term, and ſhould it go back to Rome, it would be the church of England ſtill. "The papal authority, you ſay, is con-"genial with arbitrary dominion:" be it ſo: but was not the church of England under the papal authority, when the barons eſtabliſhed *Magna Charta*, and, as you obſerve, made the firſt article, "That the church of England ſhall be free, and "enjoy her whole rights and liberties inviolable?" Now, what were thoſe rights and privileges, and what was that freedom which the barons aſſerted for her? Was it a freedom from the papal authority, or from ſubjection to the laws of the land, or from the encroachment of the crown, or of the people? If it was from the encroachments of the crown, then this boaſted freedom conſiſted either in her being ſubjected to the court of Rome, or in the exerciſe of the *inherent* rights of the church —One of which is ſlavery, according to your principles; the other is independence, with which you reproach Preſbyterians. Whilſt the church of England was Popiſh, it was often kept in the moſt diſgraceful thraldom by the court of Rome. Therefore it is not eaſy to underſtand, why you ſhould refer to that period of the eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment in England, as being friendly to liberty, ſince it is in apparent inconſiſtence with your principle, and unſupported by hiſtorical evidence.

We know that in ſucceeding times ſeveral ſtatutes were made, and particularly the 24th Henry VIII. which recites the former ſtatutes aſſerting the independence of the church of England on the church of Rome. Shall we ſay that the freedom and privileges of the church of England were then

taken away, which, you ſay, were ſecured by Magna Charta?

But you aſſert that, "ſo eſſential was the preſervation of the church eſteemed to the welfare "of the ſtate, that the barons, when they were laying the foundation of Engliſh liberty, made it "the firſt article in Magna Charta, that the church "of England ſhall be free, and enjoy her whole "rights and liberties inviolable."*

Here we have a ſtriking proof, my Lord, that even learned and ingenious men are liable to be led away by the ſound of words in direct oppoſition to their ſenſe; becauſe the freedom, that is aſſerted to the church of England in this firſt article of Magna Charta, is altogether deſtructive of what we would call, the freedom of our eſtabliſhed church at preſent. The liberty, aſſerted to the church by this famous charter, was the liberty of trampling under foot the laws of the land, of infringing an important prerogative, for which king John's father and all his anceſtors had zealouſly contended—it was eſtabliſhing the right of appeals to Rome, which were deemed ſo diſhonourable to the nation, and thereby ſubjecting it to a foreign juriſdiction. So that, perhaps, there is no period in the Engliſh hiſtory, that will leſs ſupport your principle, or will leſs ſupport the freedom of the church of England, than this of Magna Charta. For, however high the breaſts of the nobles beat in the cauſe of civil liberty, there is no period, in which the kingdom was held in greater thraldom by the court of Rome.

Let

* p. 11

Let me call your attention to the hiſtory of this period, one of the moſt remarkable in the annals of England. King John, by his ill-fated conduct, had been reduced to the neceſſity of ſurrendering his crown, in the moſt abject and humiliating manner, to a haughty and ambitious pontiff. After ſome days, he received his crown and kingdom, as a fief from the pope, and became his vaſſal. As a farther mark of his degradation, he granted a charter to the clergy, reſigning in a ſtill more formal manner the privileges and liberties of the church of England. Here was the ſupreme triumph of ſacerdotal power. Langton, archbiſhop of Canterbury, and the clergy joined the confederate nobles—The general, appointed by the barons, was called the *Mareſchal of the army of God, and of Holy Church*; and the firſt article of Magna Charta was to confirm theſe palpable uſurpations of the court of Rome.* The freedom of elections was ſecured to the clergy: The former charter of the king was confirmed, by which the neceſſity of a royal congè d'elire and confirmation was ſuperſeded: All check upon appeals to Rome was removed, by the allowance granted every man to depart the kingdom at pleaſure. And the fines upon

* Magna Charta, 1ſt. Art. That the Church of England ſhall be free, and enjoy her whole rights and liberties inviolable. And we will have them ſo to be obſerved, that it may appear that the freedom of elections, which was reckoned moſt neceſſary for the Church of England, and which we granted and confirmed by our charter, and obtained the confirmation of from Pope Innocent the Third, before the diſcord between us and our Barons, was of our mere free will; which charter we ſhall obſerve, and do will it to be faithfully obſerved by our heirs for ever.

the clergy for offences, were ordained to be proportioned to their lay eſtates, not to their eccleſiaſtical benefices.*

Was it at this time of papal tyranny, or ſince the Reformation, that the eccleſiaſtical and civil conſtitution is to be likened to "a double cone, united by the authority of the crown?"† In the reign of king John we have ſeen, that they were not thus united, and that one of them ſupported the triple crown at Rome, and overthrew the other. But this quaint ſimile is not eaſily underſtood. It is to be wiſhed you had explained it. At firſt view, it conveys no very favourable idea of the eccleſiaſtical conſtitution. It points it out as a ſeparate body from the ſtate—as having a ſeparate intereſt, and forming ſomething like imperium in imperio, a conſtitution not to be endured in a free ſtate. If, therefore, it has a different, and a better meaning, it would have been well to have explained it. This notion ſeems to have been introduced by the ill-judged policy of William the Conqueror. He augmented the ſuperſtitious veneration for Rome. —The dignified clergy pretended a total independence on the ſtate; and he broke thoſe bands of connection, which, in the Saxon times, had preſerved an union between the lay and clerical orders. Lord Lyttelton ſpeaking of this reign, ſays, "there was another alteration, which, though it "was made with the concurrence of parliament, "*eſſentially* hurt the commonwealth; I mean the "ſeparating of the civil and eccleſiaſtical juriſdic-"tions, which the Saxon biſhops and earls had "exerciſed jointly, in the county courts, by giv-

"ing

* Hume's Hiſt. of England. Vol. II. † p. 11.

" ing the biſhops a court of their own—Though " this was done under a ſpecious pretence of re- " formation—it proved a great cauſe of the cor- " ruption of the clergy, and of the advancement " of their power beyond its due bounds—includ- " ing many cauſes purely civil."*

But whatever the eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment is, and to whatever period we are to aſſign it (for you have not defined it), you aſſure us, it is " an eſ- " ſential part of the conſtitution—and that there is " a *natural* union of the civil with the eccleſiaſti- " cal branch of the conſtitution."† If it be the preſent eſtabliſhment of the Proteſtant church, which is an *eſſential* part of the conſtitution.....this poſition is contradicted by fact—for the Britannick conſtitution flouriſhed in great vigour many ages before the Reformation—But if you would include, alſo, the Popiſh eſtabliſhment in former times, you have already told us, this is congenial with arbi- trary dominion, and conſequently cannot be an *eſſential* part of a free conſtitution; nor can there be a *natural* union between them.

There is another difficulty—After laying it down that the eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment is an *eſſential* part of the conſtitution—you ſay, " the kingdom " of Scotland may perhaps be held forward in op- " poſition to theſe principles; but you anſwer, " that a ſingle exception is never a fair objection to " a general rule."—Shall we call this an overſight, or an apparent inconſiſtency in reaſoning, to al- ledge that any thing can exiſt without what is *eſſen- tial* to it? In any other ſubject this would be look-

* Hiſtory of Henry II. vol. I. p. 53. vol. II. p. 363.

† p. 12.

ed upon as a contradiction in terms; but where eccleſiaſtical authority is concerned it may ſometimes be a merit to aſſert and *believe* what is unintelligible.*

But beſides Scotland, the kingdom of Pruſſia, and ſeveral of the German principalities, will be found exceptions to your general principles; for they have not adopted eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhments, ſimilar to the ſtate. And ſtill more; prior to the Reformation, the churches in the ſeveral republicks of Europe were governed by biſhops. So that it is not *eſſential* to the nature of eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhments to be ſimilar to the civil conſtitution, nor is there any *natural* union between them.

It may be proper to mention here, what are the eſtabliſhed principles of the church of England concerning church government in a political view.

Firſt, then, it is ſaid, that a national church government in a chriſtian kingdom is neceſſary to preſerve order among the particular churches within the nation, to be a check on the manners of the clergy, and a ſecurity againſt foreign uſurpations.

2. That the national church government by archbiſhops, biſhops, archdeacons, &c. is a human conſtitution, and may be altered by the civil magiſtrate.

3. That this national church has an entire power within itſelf, and is abſolutely free, and independent of any foreign power, and that the king is as much the ſupreme head of it, as he is of the ſtate.

4. That,

* Credo quia impoſſibile.

4. That, upon this principle, our first reformers broke off from Rome, and by fixing the independency of this national church, it is secured against ever returning back to Rome.—If these be the principles of our first reformers, you will observe they are not at all favourable to your argument.

These things, however, are matters of speculation, which might be passed over, were it not that important consequences are drawn from them, which have very materially affected society. It may be more satisfactory, because more convincing, to consider the operation of these principles in our country in an historical view.

The present ecclesiastical establishment is founded on an act of parliament, 28th Henry VIII. By this statute, the supreme ecclesiastical power was vested in the crown, and the authority, that was formerly claimed and exercised by the Pope, was henceforward to be exercised by the prince. And Henry VIII. the first supreme head of *this church*, by virtue of this supereminent power, did in a very decisive manner convince the nation, that, with the change of name from Popish to Protestant, they had only changed ecclesiastical tyrants. Their minds were distracted, and kept in continual anxious suspence, whilst they looked up to their new guide to fashion their uncertain opinions according to his caprice and humour; which, to their cost, they found was as cruel and tyrannical, as that of the hated sovereign pontiffs ever had been. Henry VIII. continued to defend the doctrines of the church of Rome as fiercely, as he attacked its jurisdiction. He alternately persecuted Protestants for

for rejecting the former, and the Catholicks for acknowledging the latter; insomuch that Protestants and Papists, by the capricious cruelty of this bigoted prince, have been consumed in the same fires together. This is to be attributed to the political power of the establishment; for the religious principles of Protestants must discountenance persecution, as they are founded on the indefeasible rights of private judgment. But an ecclesiastical power, so absolute, was unfriendly to civil liberty, as well as to personal safety, and continued to produce very unhappy effects in the reign of Edward VI. in which were passed several statutes, that punished non-conformity by fines and imprisonment. The same spirit of persecution continued throughout the long reign of Queen Elizabeth, and the reigns of the several princes of the unfortunate family that succeeded her. Were we to descend to an enumeration of particular instances of persecution, the detail would be black and cruel. Let us hear in a few words the account the late Lord Chancellor King has given of them, as practised in the glorious reign of Queen Elizabeth; over which, however, he wishes to cast a veil, for the honour of that renowned queen—"Some hereticks were "burned; other persons were hanged; some had "their goods confiscated; others had their per-"sons imprisoned. And to mention more parti-"cularly, an act was passed in the 35th year of Eliza-"beth, by which the dissenters are, among other "penalties, to abjure the realm in forty days, or "suffer death without benefit of clergy—Which, "he observes, was worse than abjuration for fe-"lony, at common law; in that, they had the "benefit of clergy; in this, they had not—This "is one of the severities of Queen Elizabeth's

" reign—Whether this be wholeſome ſeverity or " not, human nature will determine—Again, " what thoſe wholeſome ſeverities were, your " lordſhips have been told; they were hanging, " burning, abjuration, confiſcation, impriſon- " ment, loſs of eſtate, liberty, and life."*

Theſe things ſhew the danger of truſting power in the hands of eccleſiaſtics of any denomination; and that this boaſted religious eſtabliſhment is capable of defeating all the good purpoſes which you alledge ſuch eſtabliſhments are fitted to produce. In the breaſt of a perſecutor there can be no religion—and accordingly we find, that in the ſolemn, ſtately reign of Elizabeth,† and in the gay, licentious reign of Charles II. religion was equally baniſhed from their courts.

We do not find in this period, where arbitrary government made great ſtrides, that the religious eſtabliſhment afforded any ſupport to the freedom of the ſtate; but ſo much the reverſe, that we have

* Sacheverel's Trial, fol. p. 71. 290.

† The character of Queen Elizabeth's church and court, from a writer of their own, is very remarkable. The churchmen heaped up many benefices upon themſelves, and reſided upon none, neglecting their cures—Many of them alienated their lands, made unreaſonable leaſes—granted reverſions and advowſons to their wives and children, or to others for their uſe—Churches ran greatly into dilapidations and decays; and were kept naſty and filthy, and undecent for God's worſhip. Among the laity there was little devotion; the Lord's-day greatly profaned; the common prayers little frequented—Some lived without any ſervice of God at all. Many were mere heathens and atheiſts—the queen's own court a kind of lawleſs place, an harbour for Epicures and Atheiſts, &c. Strype's Life of Parker, p. 395.

have the teſtimony of Hume, and he was no friend of Diſſenters, that, " ſo abſolute was the " authority of the crown (in the reign of the Tu- " dors) that the precious ſpark of liberty had been " kindled, and was preſerved by the Puritans " alone. And to this ſect the Engliſh owe the " whole freedom of their conſtitution." And they certainly have not been negligent in " inſtructing " the people in their duty, as men and citizens; " and fixing morality on the broad baſis of religi- " on; and eſtabliſhing in the mind of the ſubject " an internal principle, as a collateral aid to the " check of the law."*

As to the trite adage of James I. *no biſhop, no king*, it cannot be ſupported from Hiſtory, or any juſt political reaſoning. For, when you mention this adage, I ſuppoſe, you underſtand a biſhop veſted with a political character: but ſurely, a throne may be ſupported without ſuch aid; and innumerable kings have reigned, who never heard of ſuch biſhops. This king aimed at arbitrary government, and he flattered his biſhops, finding them ſubſervient to his purpoſe; and they, in their turn, flattered this vain prince in order to exalt the mitre.

In the ſucceeding reign, theſe intrigues were purſued with a fatal violence, and produced the moſt dreadful effects. For, while the prelates were ſo liberal in raiſing the crown at the expence of public liberty, they made no ſcruple of encroaching themſelves on the royal rights the moſt inconteſtable, in order to exalt the hierarchy, and procure

* p. 5.

cure to their own order dominion and independence. All the doctrines, which the Romish church had borrowed from some of the early fathers, and which freed the spiritual from subordination to the civil power, were now adopted by the church of England, and interwoven with her political and religious tenets. A divine and apostolical charter was insisted on, preferably to a legal and parliamentary one. The sacerdotal character was magnified as sacred and indefeasible. All right to spiritual authority, or even to private judgment in spiritual subjects, was refused to profane laymen. This account is given us by a zealous advocate of Charles I. and for the measures of his government, who adds, "So disgusted were all "the lovers of civil liberty at the *slavish* doctrines "promoted by the clergy, that they received "without control vehement invectives, (*i. e.* in "the House of Commons) against the usurpations "of the Bishops, against the high commission, "against the late convocation, against the new "canons.*"

This judgment is confirmed by men of the highest character and authority with the church. Every one, acquainted with the history of this eventful period, knows that Lord Falkland and Lord Digby were Episcopals and Royalists, and yet no men can with greater severity censure the conduct of the bishops than they have done. Falkland charges them with labouring, evidently, to bring in an English, though—not a Roman Popery; and that, whilst Masses had been said in security, a Conventicle had been a crime.† And how doth lord Digby,

* Hume's Hist. England, vol. VIII. p. 395.
† Rushworth, vol. IV. p. 184.

Digby, in the indignation of his ſoul, where he is earneſtly pleading in their behalf, deſcribe their fury and oppreſſions as beyond all enduring! "I "do not think," ſaith he, "that any people hath "been more provoked, than the *generality* of Eng- "land, of late years, by the inſolencies and ex- "orbitances of the prelates."

"I proteſt, Mr. Speaker, I cannot caſt my "thoughts on the churchmen, that have govern- "ed of late, but they appeared to me as a ſcourge "employed by God upon us, for the ſins of the "nation. For my part, I profeſs, I am ſo en- "flamed with the ſenſe of them, that I find my- "ſelf ready to cry out with the loudeſt of the "15000,* down with them, down with them to "the very ground!"† I only mention the autho- rity of ſuch men, whoſe teſtimony in this caſe, we muſt ſuppoſe, could only be extorted by the force of truth. What then, ſhall we ſay, is the political tendency of this eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſh- ment, eſpecially when we are told by the ſame au- thority, that the faults of individuals of the order proceed from the nature of the order itſelf?‡ Shall we ſay with you, that the church is ſo eſſentially incorporated with the ſtate, that the ſubverſion of one muſt neceſſarily involve the overthrow of the other, and conſequently that this religious eſtabliſh- ment is friendly to civil liberty? or ſhall we agree with the long parliament, that the eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment is in no ſort eſſential to the exiſtence of the ſtate, and to the freedom of our conſtitution?

You

* Alluding to the Petition ſigned by 15000 Citizens of Lon- don againſt the Hierarchy and Government of the Church of England, preſented to the Houſe of Commons.

† Ruſhworth, vol. IV. part 3. p. 172. ‡ Lord Falkland.

You ſpeak pretty plainly, in more places than one, of the principles of Preſbyterians, as unfriendly to the church, and ſay, " that though " they may acquieſce for a time in eſtabliſhments, " which they diſlike, from love of quiet; yet, " whenever a ſafe opportunity ſhall offer to " give free ſcope, thoſe principles will operate."* The principles you refer to are contained, I ſuppoſe, in your 19th page, and tend, as you are pleaſed to repreſent them, merely to pull down an " Eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment."

Upon what ground you have hazarded this aſſertion, I am at a loſs to conjecture. I could have wiſhed you had mentioned your authority; whether it was derived from Hiſtory, or any publick paper or record, that we might have examined it, and not have ſatisfied yourſelf with barely ſaying it was from the " leading Preſbyterians in this Kingdom;" for, as you appear to be very imperfectly acquainted with our principles, you will excuſe me for thinking that you have converſed very little with the leading Preſbyterians on the ſubject of Church Government, or on their general hiſtory.

And here, give me leave to obſerve, that the principles you mention, may be the principles of Independents, but that Preſbyterians are not Independents; to call them ſo is a contradiction in terms. You may poſſibly have met with a man, or a few men, in ſome parts of this kingdom, that are Independents; but it is not from them, but from the great Body of Preſbyterians, who compoſe

* p. 24.

compoſe the general ſynod of Ulſter, that you are to form your opinion of the principles of Preſbyterians. You would ſcarcely think it fair, if any one ſhould give an account of the principles of your Church from the Free and Candid Diſquiſitions, from Dr. Clarke's improved Liturgy, from the Biſhop of Clogher's Eſſay on Spirit, or in Eccleſiaſtical polity from Hoadly Biſhop of Bangor and his abettors. You would refer us, perhaps, rather to the Act of Uniformity, and other Eccleſiaſtical Statutes, and the opinion of Convocation; if, by the conſtitution of your Church, they have authority to give an opinion.

I would farther obſerve, that the Preſbyterians, who firſt ſettled in this Kingdom, were educated in a national Church, and therefore they could not be ſuppoſed "to reject the Idea of it." But, as Eccleſiaſtical Eſtabliſhments differ widely from one another, as they deſcend through various gradations, down from the vaſt fabrick of the Epiſcopal hierarchy to the ſimplicity of the Genevan, founded on the model of the primitive Church, it ſeemed requiſite that you ſhould have defined what you underſtand by theſe terms; and that you ſhould continue to uſe them in a certain definite ſenſe; particularly, whether you mean an Eſtabliſhment that raiſes Churchmen to diſtinguiſhed eminence for riches and power in the State, and gives them a political character as members of the Legiſlative Body. If this be your meaning, then we may diſlike ſuch an Eſtabliſhment, and yet it will not follow that we reject the idea of every other National Church. The National Church of Scotland, ſuch as it was

in

in the days of our Anceſtors, the Preſbyterians of Ireland certainly did not diſlike. The Church of Geneva they could not diſlike. They do not diſapprove of the maintenance of the Clergy by the State. Thus they are maintained in Scotland, and on the Continent: and the Preſbyterian Miniſters of Ireland have, for more than a century, received a ſmall ſalary from the Crown, and which, however ſmall, they have received with moſt grateful acknowledgments, as a mark of the Royal favour and protection, and which, from the favourable diſpoſitions of Government, they hope will be augmented; but they think the Clergy ſhould be choſen by the people; and that Eccleſiaſtical diſcipline ſhould be exerciſed by the Paſtors of the Church aſſiſted by the people. They think all equally good ſubjects ſhould be equally protected by the State, and that there ſhould be an univerſal toleration of Religion,—that the King is not the head of your Church alone, but that in his political character, he is the head of all his people, to whom they all owe equal allegiance.

You aſſert, however, that our principles tend merely to pull "down an eccleſiaſtical Eſtabliſh-"ment." How is this proved? not by hiſtorical evidence; for that is clearly againſt you. Beyond all doubt, it is not the general principle of Preſbyterians to "reject the idea of a "National Church;" this you acknowledge; the preſumption therefore is, that the Preſbyterians of Ireland do not reject it; and it is incumbent on you to prove your aſſertion, and ſhew at what period they adopted this opinion, in contradiction to their principles at their original ſet-

tlement in this Kingdom, and in oppoſition, as you tell us, to all "their Brethren of Geneva, Swit-"zerland, Holland, Germany, and Scotland."

But if you mean your own Eſtabliſhment, and that our principles would lead us to uſe violence in pulling it down, you are called upon to bring a particular charge founded on facts; and to tell us alſo what you mean by a "*ſafe opportunity*, "which, when it ſhall offer, will give free ſcope "to our principles to operate." This you ought to have done, or not to have brought the charge againſt us. However, ſince you have not choſen to ſpeak out plainly, I will tell you what I would reckon a *ſafe* opportunity. If your Church ſhould, unhappily, at any time hereafter, give reaſon to her chief members among our Nobility and Commons, to cenſure her conduct with ſuch ſeverity as was uſed by the Lords Falkland and Digby, and ſo many others in the reign of Charles I.; if the legiſlature in England and in Ireland ſhould think it for the intereſt and happineſs of theſe kingdoms, to aboliſh the preſent eccleſiaſtical Eſtabliſhment by acts of Parliament—Then, the Preſbyterians of Ireland might think it a *ſafe* opportunity——And if, in the courſe of things, it ſhould appear eligible to the wiſdom of Parliament to change the eccleſiaſtical Eſtabliſhment, don't be afraid that the proteſtant aſcendency, or the ſtability of government would be in any danger from the want of another national Church. For, if a national Church be eſſential to the civil conſtitution, the Preſbyterians might diſappoint your anxious fears for the ſafety of the State; and as they ſo far outnumber your Church, they would give a greater ſtrength to the conſtitu-

tion;

tion; becauſe, on your own principles, ſo many more might, then, be "truſted as cordial friends "to the State, with the moſt perfect conſiſten-"cy." And on their own principles, they would fix the Crown, not on the narrow points of two divided cones, which have ſometimes made it a crown of thorns, but on a ſolid pyramid, whoſe baſis would be as extenſive as their influence: for in that caſe we muſt lament the loſs of *all good churchmen* as cordial friends to the State; becauſe, if I underſtand your opinion right, it would ſeem to imply, that none can be truſted, if they, or their party, be not well paid for it.

But your fears for the ſafety of your church from thoſe dreaded levelling principles of Preſbyterians, whether real or feigned, may ſafely be diſmiſſed; for the Church of England was never yet in danger of being pulled down, but by her own members. And to this memorable tranſaction I would wiſh to call your attention, as your conjectures, or your fears, are grounded, perhaps, on that very remarkable tranſaction of the laſt century.

And here I would obſerve from the proceedings of the long Parliament, that the defence of civil liberty and the conſtitution was their firſt and principal conſideration. This at the beginning engaged all their care and attention: and the hierarchy was at length ſtruck at, only, becauſe it was judged unfriendly to the freedom of the State. This was, profeſſedly, the cauſe of the firſt attack upon the Biſhops. It was intended to deprive them of every ſort of *civil* juriſdiction, and

particularly of their votes in the houſe of Lords, becauſe they were blindly devoted to the court. Many of the Peers were much diſpoſed to this, believing it could do the church no harm, if the Biſhops had fewer diverſions from their ſpiritual charges. *

Let it be farther obſerved, that whatever may be charged on the ambition of ſome, or on the craft and enthuſiaſm of others, in the ſubſequent conteſt between the King and Parliament, we are now ſpeaking of a time, when the attention of the nation was turned towards the deliberations of a council of men, which the neceſſity of the King's affairs, in ſpite of his inclinations, and all his favourite principles of policy, had forced him to call together—a council of men worthy of the arduous taſk, they were now to undertake; choſen by the people of England, not through the influence of corruption, but under the awful ſenſe, that all that was dear to them, as a country of liberty, was, by the wiſdom and fortitude of their repreſentatives, now to be preſerved, or to periſh, and be loſt for ever.

Notwithſtanding the alarming exigency of the caſe, they ſuffered not themſelves to be precipitated into random preſcriptions, but with manly compoſure of ſpirit ſet themſelves, by a careful inquiry and patient inveſtigation, to find out the original and latent ſources of all this miſchief—In conſequence of which, in ſpite of all preconceived opinions, and in ſpite of the prejudices of education, how quickly did they come to

* Clarendon Hiſt. p. 133.

to discover, and to be fully convinced—" That " the constitution of the ecclesiastical hierarchy " had been one of the most powerful engines, in " the hands of a devout and arbitrary spirited " prince, by which he had well nigh eff ct d the " total subversion of the laws and liberties of " his country. And the absolute necessity there " was, *in the circumstances they were then in*, for " wresting this engine out of his hands. And " they therefore declare, that the government of " the Church by Archbishops, Bishops, their " Chancellors, and Commissaries, Deans, Arch- " deacons, and other ecclesiastical Officers, hath " been found, by long experience, to be a great " impediment to the perfect reformation and " growth of religion, and very prejudicial to " the State and Government of this kingdom, " &c." *

Here, then, is a testimony as unexceptionable as can well be given by human wisdom, that the *ecclesiastical hierarchy* is, in its constitution and natural course of operation, dangerous to the liberty and legal government of Britain, but extremely friendly to kingly domination, and arbitrary power. And this is the more remarkable, as this assembly of patriots, for purity of manners, wisdom of council, and heroism of spirit, the most venerable that England or, perhaps, any other country ever produced, was composed almost entirely of episcopals.

For Clarendon tells us, " that in the house of " Peers there were only two, at that time, ta-

 " ken

* Preamble to the Bill for abolishing Episcopacy.

"ken notice of, the lords *Say* and *Brooke*; and "of the leaders in the houſe of commons, Fi-"enne and Vane, and afterwards Hambden, "were *believed* to be enemies to the whole fa-"brick of the Church, and to deſire a diſſolution "of it. For without doubt, the major part of "that body conſiſted of men, who had no mind "to a breach." *

In this great tranſaction, Preſbyterians had little ſhare—they had no power to aboliſh the eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment—no other power could have aboliſhed it but the parliament of England; nor is it likely any other power will ever aboliſh it. Proteſtant diſſenters do wiſh, no doubt, to ſee your church farther reformed, and in this they are joined by many members of the church: And they earneſtly wiſh that government may very ſoon engage in that arduous undertaking. But we know this muſt originate in England, and be perfected there; and then, according to the changes that ſhall take place in it, there may, or may not, be fewer diſſenters.

But, ſtill, conſidering it in a view merely political, we have the authority of an Engliſh parliament that it is not *eſſential* to the civil conſtitution, as you would aſſert. So that the ſtate is in no danger from the diſturbances which alarm you ſo much. Its native vigour will ſupport it, let the church government be what it may; and whether tithes be well or ill paid, or whether our government ſhall think fit to continue tithes, or appoint any other maintenance of the clergy, according as their wiſdom ſhall think beſt. You

* Hiſt. page 133.

You exult in the revival of the hierarchy at the Reſtoration—and yet during the reign of Charles II. the political principles of churchmen did them no honour, as members of a free ſtate. Their favourite doctrines of paſſive obedience—non reſiſtance—the divine right of kings*—and the damnable ſin of ſchiſm, did not ſhew their inviolable attachment to our admired conſtitution. For who is there in our day, that will not acknowledge theſe principles to be ſubverſive of civil liberty, and of all legal government?

If the oppoſition of the ſeven Biſhops to King James be brought forward to redeem the character of the clergy, ſorry would I be to deny them the praiſe that may be due to them. Theſe prelates had been as induſtrious, as their brethren, to poiſon the minds of the people and the king, by inſtilling into them the moſt ſlaviſh or arbitrary principles. The king, being a ready pupil, and as fond of theſe doctrines as they could have wiſhed him, was not ſlack in reducing them to practice. And he attempted to execute them, it would ſeem, prudently, where the largeſt profeſſions had been made of an unlimited obedience, and therefore, where he might expect the moſt implicit ſubmiſſion. But, he found himſelf, here, moſt miſerably diſappointed and miſtaken—Happy for the nation and for the Proteſtant religion, that theſe men were falſe to their principles! In a Hampden, or a Ruſſel, or a Sydney, ſuch oppoſition would have been juſtly deemed noble, manly, reſolute: it

 would

* Les princes ne tiennent, diſent-ils, leur pouvoir que de Dieu ſeul. Cette maxime, imaginée par le Clergé—ne met les rois au-deſſus des peuples, que pour commander aux rois mêmes au nom de la Divinité. Abbé Rainal Hiſt. tom. VI.

would have been deemed worthy of every praiſe, and have reflected additional luſtre on their diſtinguiſhed and venerable names, through every age, as being conſiſtent with the glory of their characters—But, in ſuch men, and profeſſing ſuch principles, we can only admire the ſpirit of the conſtitution burſting forth, and riſing ſuperior to their avowed doctrines of ſlavery.*

The high church party, throughout the kingdom, behaved in the like unworthy and inglorious manner. By a diſhonourable proſtitution of principles and character, as members of a *free* ſtate ...they puſhed on this infatuated prince to the moſt licentious abuſe of power: and in the end, did as much by their ſlayiſh principles of abſolute, paſſive obedience, and by their diſingenuity, to ruin the Stuart family, as Cromwell, by all his dexterity, and proweſs, and his moſt adventurous courage.

The power and domination of eccleſiaſticks was checked at the Revolution. Their turbulent temper broke out towards the end of Queen Anne's reign, but by the wiſdom of the preſent royal family, moderate churchmen have been generally advanced and countenanced, and the nation has enjoyed more internal peace and ſecurity, than in any period ſince the foundation of the monarchy. So that, it would ſeem, the happineſs of the people has riſen in proportion as the power of the clergy has diminiſhed. Here, again, we are juſtified

* It was a ſaying of thoſe times, "Of the ſeven Golden Candleſticks put into the tower by King James, five of them proved Prince's metal."

fied in our concluſion, that your eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment, " in a view merely political," is not an eſſential part of our civil conſtitution. Nor is it " preciſely formed on the ſame model," as you aſſert:* for in that caſe the biſhops muſt have been hereditary, as our peers are: and the lower houſe of convocation muſt have been choſen by the people, if they are ſuppoſed to repreſent the church according to the definition of the church in the XXXIX articles. But you do not uſe the word in this ſenſe; you uſe it to denote the clergy, a building, or houſe of prayer,—and often a political conſtitution, which ambiguous and indefinite uſe of the word occaſions confuſion and perplexity, and ought to be avoided in diſcuſſions of this ſort.

The political eſtabliſhment of the church, which you propoſe, only, to conſider, is not an *eſſential* part of the civil conſtitution. It is not ſo eſſential as our courts of law, which are moſt intimately blended and interwoven with the conſtitution, and may with much propriety be ſaid to be eſſential to it——or as a well regulated military force, by which the internal and external peace of the ſtate is ſecured. It ſhould rather be conſidered as a matter of regulation, which may be modelled according to the views of government,—may be continued or laid aſide, and the throne remain firm on an immovable baſis—and the ſtate be in no danger of " riſking any of thoſe *tremendous* evils,"† with which you would alarm us, and which are merely imaginary, dictated by prejudice and the ſpirit of party.

* p. 11. † p. 80.

But you ſpeak in high terms of this church eſtabliſhment, as if it alone gave ſtability to our admired conſtitution—and then, again, you deſcribe the clergy a *helpleſs* "claſs of men," * and call aloud for ſupport, not only from government, but from Preſbyterians—Here is the moſt apparent inconſiſtency; for you have ſaid before, that the members of the *Eſtabliſhed* Church alone can be cordial friends to the *entire conſtitution* of this realm with *perfect conſiſtency of principle.* † If this means any thing, the entire conſtitution muſt mean the church and ſtate, and the reaſon why Preſbyterians cannot be cordial friends, is their diſſent from the church—and yet you call upon them to ſupport you in that part alone, where you ſay they cannot be cordial friends, with conſiſtency of principle. What ſhall we ſay of ſuch reaſoning as this? and what credit will the publick give to thoſe charges you have brought againſt Preſbyterians, which you yourſelf ſeem immediately to relinquiſh? The nation is not ſo blind, as to think the ſtate is in the ſmalleſt danger from the diſtreſſes of the South—and your want of information in regard to the principles and conduct of the Preſbyterians of Ulſter, where you lived ſo long, will induce them to receive with caution all that you have ſaid concerning the riſings and tumults in Munſter.

Another apparent inconſiſtency I might mention, is, when ſpeaking on commutation, you find a ſtrong objection from the difficulty of aſcertaining the value of church livings—but you find no difficulty to ſtate their value and form an average, when you wanted to ſhew the *very ſcanty* appoint-

 ments

* p. 93—78. † p. 11.

ments of the clergy; you did more, you could find out the appointments of other churches in Britain and on the continent. So that we cannot help admiring that happy facility of making every thing *bend* to ſecure the payment of tithes. In ſtating the average of church livings too, you have choſen to omit the revenues of the biſhops, and an account of ſome of thoſe ſees where the church livings are greateſt. This omiſſion may be immaterial in this kingdom; but in regard to ſtrangers, into whoſe hands your book may come, it might not have been improper to inform them, that the church enjoys, as is ſuppoſed, the thirteenth part of the lands of Ireland; a circumſtance which would ſatisfy them, that with ſo great a landed intereſt, the clergy are in no danger of wanting ſupport.

You have advanced ſeveral modes of commutation, and have overthrown them; and we will ſuppoſe your objections to be well founded; but it does not, therefore, follow, that there may not be other modes, which would be effectual both for the eaſe of the people and of the clergy. Whenever government ſhall be deſirous of entering in good earneſt into the ſubject of commutation, it will be no difficult matter to find out a mode, tha will effectually anſwer the end.

t

You are anxiouſly attentive to the emoluments of the clergy, and ſeem to think it material that, in any propoſed ſcheme of commutation, the amount of each living ſhould at leaſt remain as great as it is at preſent. But in a new regulation, this might ſeem unneceſſary, or improper. The value

value and extent of parishes appear to have arisen from accidental circumstances. We see livings, worth perhaps 1000l. a year, contiguous to small towns or villages; and others of little amount, adjacent to considerable towns or cities. This might be altered without hurting the political importance of the establishment, and it will scarcely be alledged that the moral or religious purposes, which you mention, will be defeated, if instead of 1000l. a year, the successor should have only the half, or even a quarter of that income: Because it will, generally, be found that wealth is unfriendly to labour. And though in the highest departments of the law, the incessant labour and unwearied attention bear proportion to the dignity of rank, and emolument of office, it is far otherwise in the church. With the sages of the law it is a maxim, that "where no service is done, nothing "is due;" if this were adopted by the church, many complaints concerning the clergy would be no longer heard of.

In Scotland, you say their parishes amount, on an average, to 140l. 16s. 8d. Irish: and in your church, if the national allotment were distributed in equal portions, the nett sum for each clergyman would amount only to 133l. 6s.* Here now it would seem you have given a precedent in favour of commutation: for, in virtue of that, or something equivalent to it, the livings of the Scotch clergy were settled, and they are higher, as you have stated them, than those of your clergy. If therefore such advancement be desirable, it might be very material for the consideration of government,

* p. 43.

ment, ſhould they go into this important ſubject, under the ſanction of your name. But would the eſtabliſhed clergy of this kingdom thank you for ſuch advancement of their livings? or would they treat the propoſal as a *levelling* principle? "to re-"duce clerical incomes to ſo baſe a level, as will "exclude from the ſacred function all men of *in-*"*genuous* birth, promiſing abilities, and liberal "education; and leave a truſt, ſo difficult as well "as important, involving together with religion, "every political and private intereſt, to the loweſt "of the people."* Whether ſuch complaint would be made on the preſent ſuppoſition, I will not ſay: Nor will I pretend to judge, whether this higher ſtandard of the Church of Scotland ought to be adopted by your church. The only ſtandard, that would appear moſt deſirable, is, that which will induce men of competent learning and abilities, to devote themſelves to the clerical office, and will ſecure a proper attention to the duties of the paſtoral care. In Scotland, theſe great ends of a national Church are well provided for. Among their miniſters we find the names of Robertſon and Blair, of Leechman, Campbell, Reid, and others of diſtinguiſhed learning, who do honour to their country: and in this Church pluralities and non-reſidence are unknown, and unheard of, except when mention is made of the ſhameful practices of other churches; for here a conſtant *perſonal* attention to the duties of their office is indiſpenſable—you know how much it is the reverſe in ſome other Churches, and particularly in your own.

The ſubordination of ranks amongſt the Clergy will ſcarcely be objected here, becauſe you ſay, "that

* p. 40.

" that is a point of doubtful diſcuſſion, and is to-
" tally irrelevant to the preſent queſtion. But
" you aſk what particular miſchief could ariſe
" from the wealth of the Clergy, circumſtanced
" as ours, were their appointment—as great as
" ſome men falſely imagine?" * Even the ſame that has ever ariſen from the wealth and opulence of the Clergy—indolence, non-reſidence, neglect of duty, avarice increaſing in proportion as riches increaſe—the conſequent luſt of power and dominion, and, when a *ſafe opportunity* offers, all the miſchiefs that have ariſen from this ſource ſince the days of Conſtantine, in every country, and in every age †.

But, be this as it may, you tell us, that " the
" State has allotted tithes for the maintenance of
" the Clergy. It is the moſt ancient eſtabliſhment
" in the realm," and for this you refer us to *Selden*. But it would have been more ſatisfactory to have laid before your reader an account of the inſtitution of tithes in this kingdom, as early as we have any records of it—whether the clergy were proprietors or truſtees, as in other churches, at ſo remote a period. For when Chriſtianity became the reigning religion, before the inſtitution of

* p. 47.

† Plus ſcandalizat laicos pompa hæc clericorum, quam ædificat: plus ad indignationem, et murmur, et invidiam eos excitat, quam ad amorem: et plus auget in his avaritiam et ſuperbiam, quam extinguat. Neque poteſt Sacerdos pompaticus verbo et exemplo, humilitatem, frugalitatem, et ſobrietatem, aliis perſuadere—Munditia mentis facit ornamentum Clericorum—alioquin Chriſtus et ejus Apoſtoli non ſufficienter ornaſſent eccleſiam, et honoraſſent, quando talia in ſe contempſerunt, et aliis ſpernenda ſuaſerunt. Spalat. de Repub. l. 9.

tithes,

tithes, the eccleſiaſtical revenues continued for ſome ages to be divided into four parts: whereof one went to the Biſhop, a ſecond to the inferior Clergy, a third to the poor, and a fourth to the repairs of the Church, and of other publick buildings*. Tithes, in the original inſtitution of them, and for a conſiderable time afterwards, were not conſidered as a proviſion for the Clergy alone, but as the eſtate of the Church, or congregation of the faithful; out of which the poor and the places for religious worſhip were to be provided for. This is ſo clear to thoſe converſant in Church hiſtory, as to require no proof; and it is plain that tithes were originally received by the Clergy, not as a *property*, but under a truſt, to be divided as the Canons direct†. And leſt the truſtees

* Quatuor, tam de reditu Eccleſiæ, quam de oblatione fidelium fiebant portiones: prima erat pontificis: ſecunda Clericorum: pauperum tertia: quarta fabricis Eccleſiæ deputabatur. Gelaſius Papa cit. a Valeſio in Annotat. in Theod. Lector. l. 2. p. 567. & p. 170.

† Theodorus Lector ſays, the cuſtom of the Church of Rome was to hold no poſſeſſions, and if lands were given, immediately to ſell them: Και εθος ειναι εις μοιρας τριις διαιρεισθαι; Και το μεν τη εκκλησία διδοσθαι, το δε, τω επισκοπω, το δε, κληρω. Hiſt. Eccl. l. II. p. 567. The ſame cuſtom was retained in England in the diſtribution of tithes, ſo late as in the year 1014, as appears by the laws of Ethelred:—De decimis, Rex et Sapientes ejus ſtatuerunt et decreverunt, prout juſtum eſt, quod una pars Decimarum illarum quæ ad Eccleſiam pertinent detur ad Reſtaurationem Eccleſiæ, et ſecunda pars Dei Miniſtris, tertia Pauperibus Dei et inopibus Servilibus. Wilkins, f. 113. Again, Sancti etiam patres ſtatuerunt, ut Eccleſiæ Dei decimas ſuas quique conferant; *tradanturque eæ ſacerdoti, qui eaſdem in tres diſtribuat portiones*, unam ad Eccleſiæ Reparationem, alteram Pauperibus erogandam, tertiam vero Miniſtris Dei qui Eccleſiam ibi curant. Canones Ælfrici. Spelm. Con. Vol. I. 578.

ſhould

ſhould be tempted to apply too large a ſhare of the truſt-eſtate to their own uſe, the wiſdom of thoſe ages provided, that the diſtribution ſhould be made in a publick manner before witneſſes; for which we have the authority of Mr. Selden, whom you have quoted*. Now, if this, or any thing ſimilar to it, was the firſt inſtitution of tithes in Ireland, it is evident, that they were not the property of the Clergy: and if the inſtitution was different, it would have been ſatisfactory to have pointed it out. For the matter is not ſo clear, as to "require no proof;" nor does it appear from any thing you have ſaid, that "it is due of com-"mon right," or that it "is the moſt ancient eſta-"bliſhment in the realm, prior to the date of the "titles of almoſt every eſtate;" and much leſs that "no other perſon has the ſhadow of a claim "to it." I do not pretend to ſay what was the original inſtitution in Ireland; but the preſumption is that it was ſimilar to the inſtitutions of England and Rome, from which the preſent claim of the Church is a manifeſt deviation, whether it be, or be not, "ſanctioned by ſtatute law†." Therefore, when you are conſidering the defects in the ſettlement of your Church, and the means of remedying them, might it not be of uſe to recur to firſt principles, and apply part of your revenues, as

* Ipſi Sacerdotes a populis ſuſcipiant Decimas, & Nomina eorum quicunque dederint ſcripta habeant, & ſecundum Authoritatem Canonicam *coram Teſtibus* dividant; & ad ornamentum Eccleſiæ primam eligant partem, ſecundam autem ad uſum pauperum & peregrinorum per eorum manus miſericorditer cum omni humilitate diſpenſent, tertiam vero ſibimet ipſis ſacerdotes reſervent. Selden of Tithes, 4to. f. 196, 1 Spelman 259.

† p. 26.

at

at firſt deſigned, to the building and repairs of Churches and Glebe-houſes, inſtead of perpetually, and as it would ſeem, improperly applying to parliament for large grants of money for theſe purpoſes. But here again, perhaps you will diſcover the *levelling* principles of Preſbyterians; if ſo, it is hoped you will treat them with indulgence, ſince we find that the kings of England, as far down as the eleventh century, with their nobility and prelates, entertained thoſe *levelling* principles, and were ſolicitous, both by ſtatute and canon law, to ſecure an equitable dividend of the tithes. But the clergy being intruſted with the diſtribution, though under the caution already mentioned, quickly engroſſed the whole to themſelves: Which eaſily accounts, it has been alledged, for the extraordinary zeal that has diſcovered itſelf in after ages on this head*.

The encomiums you beſtow on the Clergy of the South, I hope, are well merited, though the ſame favourable opinion has not always been entertained of them; and their conduct has been ſometimes repreſented in parliament by gentlemen of your own Church, in a light not very honourable to them: for which it may be enough to refer you to the printed debates in the Iriſh parliament, ann. 1763 and 1764; particularly the ſpeeches of L. O. and J. G. afterwards a learned judge and a peer. Where "the inſurrections of that time are "attributed to the ſhameful negligence of our "Clergy, and the defects in our religious inſtitu-"tion—to our having a mere nominal clergy, "whoſe conduct appears chargeable with the moſt

* Examinat. Codex Jur. Eccl. Angl. p. 97.

" ſlagitious injuſtice, and the moſt cruel oppreſ-
" ſion. Lord A—y ſpeaks of enforcing the reſi-
" dence of the beneficed clergy by a penal law.
" It is true indeed, ſaith he, that the ſuperiors of
" the church have a power already to enforce re-
" ſidence; why they do not exert it is beſt known
" to themſelves, but why it ſhould be taken out
" of their hands who do not exert it; or, at leaſt
" why it ſhould be lodged where it would be ex-
" erted, is, I think, ſufficiently known to us*".
If the power alluded to here be any part of your eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment, which you aſſert to be *eſſential* to the ſtate, it is plain his lordſhip had a very different idea of it: He thought it was abuſed, and might be taken away, and expreſſes no ſort of apprehenſion that the ſtate ſhould thereby be endangered. It is farther evident, that in his judgment there was no *natural* union of the civil with this part of the eccleſiaſtical conſtitution. The defects, complained of here, are very different from thoſe that engroſs your attention; the principal defects which you point out ariſe from the want of money and of glebes: and the means you propoſe of remedying them is by farther grants from parliament. Thoſe mentioned above are of a much more ſerious and important nature: they are defects in our eccleſiaſtical inſtitution——ſhameful negligence of our ſuperior as well as inferior clergy, inſomuch that it is alledged, " that many pa-
" riſhes might truly ſay, as the diſciples at Epheſus
" to St. Paul, We have not ſo much as heard
" whether there be any Holy Ghoſt†". If there be any foundation for ſuch complaints at preſent,

* Vol. II. p. 655, to 661. † Ibid.

and

and if farther grants be neceſſary for the purpoſe you mention, it is for the wiſdom of parliament to conſider in what hands they ſhall be lodged, as the power veſted in the hierarchy has, it ſeems, but a few years ago been ſo much abuſed.

By the non-reſidence of the clergy, their duty is not only neglected, but it is acknowledged, and has been long lamented that the Proteſtant intereſt in ſome parts of the kingdom ſuffers by it. Your apology grounded on the want of glebes muſt appear ſomewhat extraordinary*. In other departments of the ſtate, no ſuch apology is made or thought of. We don't ſee that the venerable ſages of the law deſert their painful and laborious office, becauſe the ſtate has not provided them with palaces—that the gentlemen of the revenue, ſome of whom are of diſtinguiſhed rank and family, neglect their duty in the metropolis or country, for want of houſes or lands being provided for them. Why ſhould it be more difficult for the Clergy than for thoſe gentlemen to procure the neceſſary accommodations?—Are their perſons more precious, that they muſt be more delicately lodged and provided for?—Is their duty of leſs importance, that it may more eaſily be diſpenſed with?—Is it by ſuch conduct, that they are to inſtruct others in the conſcientious diſcharge of the various duties of life; and is it thus they would "fix morality "on the ſure baſis of religion, and eſtabliſh in the "mind of the ſubject an internal principle—in "aid of the check of the law?" or does their example, in this inſtance, do the reverſe of all this? and by their contempt of duty, do they teach

* p. 53.

others, alſo, to neglect theirs, either to one another, or their country? How ſhall we comprehend this myſterious character?—ſo important and aſſuming.....that can with confidence hope to ſupport itſelf with government and the kingdom, without that honourable and noble diſcharge of duty, which alone can ſtamp dignity on any character? Ay; but the deſertion of duty was ſanctioned at that illuſtrious æra of magna charta, in which you triumph, as the ſecurity of the freedom of the church. Hear the ſevere cenſure which an hiſtorian hath adduced from a diſtinguiſhed prelate of that time:....." There cannot be a greater " defection, or which carries with it a more di- " rect oppoſition to the doctrine of our Saviour " and his apoſtles, than to deſtroy men by de- " priving them of the paſtoral office; and yet " it is evident that thoſe are guilty of this ſin, " who undertake the ſacerdotal function, and re- " ceive the profits without diſcharging the duty. " For in the ſcripture account, the paſtor who neg- " lects his *flock* is a murderer of the *ſheep*. Can " one help therefore conſidering as a moſt fla- " grant crime, a conduct which tends ſo ſtrongly " to the deſtruction of truth and virtue, and the " happineſs of mankind*?" But I preſume, enough has been already ſaid on magna charta, to ſhew how utterly it ſubverts the liberty and independence of the church of England; and that its firſt article ſtands in direct oppoſition to the purpoſe, for which you have adduced it.——An author muſt be in a very uneaſy ſituation, when he *feels* himſelf confronted by the authorities he appeals to.

* Rapin's Hiſt. Eng. Vol. III. p. 518.

Your

Your defence of pluralities and great livings on the preſumption, that they are proper as a reward of ſuperior learning, will not be deemed ſufficient; becauſe the fact is otherwiſe: they are *not* beſtowed on clergymen diſtinguiſhed for learning, and perhaps you will not be able to point out in a century, three inſtances, where livings with great endowments have been given on account of ſuperior learning.

You take no notice of farmers, either gentlemen or cottagers, members of the eſtabliſhed church, being averſe to the payment of tithes, but charge this averſion wholly on diſſenters; whereas, if I am not much miſinformed, the cottager that goes to church, is for the moſt part as averſe to the viſit of the tithe-farmer in this province as the Preſbyterian, who has never given cauſe for your unkind reflections on this head*. "Facts are the "only ſure ground-work for the deciſion of this "point:" therefore you ought to have produced the facts in ſupport of your charge, and not have reſted it on bare ſurmiſe or aſſertion, which cannot be admitted as proof. You ſay, "that the "preſent argument does not apply to—an im"peachment of their conduct, but merely to the "effects of their principles—towards the conſtitu"tion of the kingdom†". But how is the effect of principles to be known but by conduct? You cannot impeach their conduct, and therefore indulge yourſelf in the liberty of framing ſuch principles, and drawing ſuch inferences from them, as may beſt ſuit your purpoſe of "ſounding an

* p. 40. † p. 20.

"alarm," and at the ſame time may tend to give an unfavourable opinion of Preſbyterians to government; which certainly is unfair and ungenerous.

Inſtead of purſuing any farther the indefinite charges you have brought againſt Preſbyterians in many parts of your book, it may be more ſatisfactory to lay before the publick a ſummary account of the ſettlement and conduct of that body in Ireland, extracted from their records, by which every one, intereſted in this argument, may form the cleareſt opinion of their principles, and whether they have not a juſt claim to the moſt perfect confidence of government.

The Preſbyterians ſettled in Ireland, by encouragement from the crown, in the reign of James I. When that prince came to the throne, he found this kingdom in ſo diſtracted a ſtate, as not to be able to levy the revenues of the crown, nor execute the laws, nor protect his ſubjects, without military force.

A law paſſed in the reign of Philip and Mary againſt bringing in the Scots, retaining them or intermarrying with them. The deſign of this law was to prevent the ſpreading of the Reformation. It continued in force during the long reign of Queen Elizabeth. But in the reign of James I. the Iriſh Parliament repealed it, and gave a parliamentary encouragement and invitation to the Scotch nation to ſettle in Ireland, thereby to promote the reformed religion, the ſettlement of the kingdom, and to ſupport the Engliſh intereſt. This laid the foundation of what in our hiſtory is called the Plantation of Ulſter, which proved the moſt

moſt effectual means of promoting theſe purpoſes, and of checking the frequent inſurrections, that laid waſte and diſtracted this country. From this plantation of Ulſter have ſprung not a few of our nobility, and moſt of the principal families in the province.

The firſt Preſbyterian miniſters came over with this colony, under the ſanction of government, not as Diſſenters from the eſtabliſhed church, but rather as comprehended in it; being ſo far encouraged and ſupported by the ſtate, that all of them were inducted into the churches and had the tithes. And Echlin, biſhop of Down, and Knox of Rapho, joined with their Preſbyteries in their ordinations. They frequently met and conſulted with the biſhops about affairs of common concernment to the intereſt of religion; ſome of them were members of the convocation, in the year 1634. The mutual moderation of the Epiſcopals and Preſbyterians in Ireland at that time was of eſſential ſervice to the ſettlement and plantation of Ulſter.

It is remarkable that this plantation was much promoted by means of the hard treatment of Preſbyterians at that time in England and Scotland; for perſecution drove many of them from both kingdoms into Ireland; and thoſe, who gave too much countenance to their ill treatment at *home*, found it for the publick ſafety of Ireland, and the Proteſtant religion, to protect them here.

It is farther to be obſerved, that after the principles and character of the Preſbyterians, who came into the province, were publickly known, even as long after as the tenth year of the reign of Charles I. the parliament of Ireland made an act for the

naturalization of all the Scottiſh nation, born before the acceſſion of King James to the crown of England and Ireland. The deſign of the act was to give farther encouragement to ſome of the Scots, who had ſettled in Ireland while the law of Philip and Mary was in force, and were liable to certain inconveniences mentioned in the act, and alſo to encourage more of that nation to come over and ſettle in Ireland. And the parliament particularly ſets forth the uſefulneſs of the Scots for promoting the happineſs of the kingdom, by the "farther ci-
"vilizing, ſtrengthening, and ſecuring this realm
"againſt rebels at home, and all foreign inva-
"ſion."

Here is one of the moſt ample teſtimonies, and from the parliament too, of the loyalty and uſefulneſs of the Scotch planters in Ulſter. And whoever compares this with the deſolated ſtate in which they found the country, when they came to it, muſt acknowledge the juſtice of the obſervation, made by the Preſbyterian miniſters of the North of Ireland in their firſt apology to Queen Anne; wherein they ſay,

"That ſince our firſt ſettlement in Ulſter, an
"hundred years ago, by encouragement from the
"crown, the Britiſh and Proteſtant intereſt, which
"was very weak before, has been conſiderably
"ſtrengthened by our means, to that degree, as
"to have a great influence on the ſafety and peace
"of the whole kingdom, of which your royal
"predeceſſors have been very ſenſible."

The union and comprehenſion of the Epiſcopal and Preſbyterian church of Ireland continued to promote

promote their mutual peace and happineſs, till it was broken by the intemperate zeal and bigotry of archbiſhop Laud, againſt the mind of the venerable and learned primate Uſher. After this time the Preſbyterians were ſubjected to much hardſhip, but continued ſteady friends to the conſtitution. They oppoſed the violent meaſures of King Charles's adminiſtration—and they oppoſed his violent death, which was contrived by the Independents and Cromwell.

They oppoſed the authority of the Rump parliament and their Republick, refuſed the oath called the *Engagement*, which abjured the ancient conſtitution of King, Lords, and Commons; for which they were treated with great ſeverity by Venables, Fleetwood, and the Commiſſioners of the *Rump*.

The principal gentlemen and miniſters were ſummoned to appear before the commiſſioners at Carrickfergus, to ſubmit to the Republick. They firſt proteſted againſt their authority, and amidſt a vaſt concourſe of people, the miniſters continued, during a long conference, to maintain that the then prevalent power in England was an illegal uſurpation—that it was unlawful to abjure the king and houſe of lords, whoſe title they ſtrenuouſly aſſerted; and they exhorted their people with a courage and ſteadineſs, becoming the cauſe they maintained, to be juſt and loyal to the King, and to refuſe the *Engagement*.

The commiſſioners, finding they could make no impreſſion on the Preſbyterians, formed a deſign of clearing the North of Ireland of them, and of tranſporting

tranſporting them to the South, where they imagined their Commonwealth could not receive ſo much oppoſition from them, when they were no longer to be ſupported by their near and intimate connection with their brethren in Scotland. But in the mean time, while the commiſſioners were full of this project, and juſt about ſending the miniſters aboard a ſhip lying ready in the harbour, the publick attention was rouſed by the account, that Cromwell had raiſed the parliament, diſſolved the Commonwealth, and made himſelf Lord Protector.

The ſame ſteady oppoſition was carried on againſt Cromwell as againſt the *Republick*, and for the ſame reaſons. After his ſon Henry was made governor of Ireland, he being of a generous temper, the Preſbyterians, for ſome time, enjoyed greater peace than formerly; but refuſed all compliance with his court. He, at length, wrote them threatening letters full of reſentment, and ſome of their miniſters were charged to appear before his council. Henry demanded the reaſons, why they and their brethren would not obſerve the faſts and thankſgivings appointed by his authority; to which they anſwered, *that their conſciences did not allow them to comply with any power, that was againſt the conſtitution and lawful magiſtracy of the kingdom.* He was much incenſed at this anſwer, and accuſed them of ingratitude, alluding to a ſalary of one hundred pounds a-year which each of them had from government. But they did not look upon that ſalary as laying them under any obligation to acknowledge the authority of the uſurpers who had taken the tithes from them, and had given them one hundred pounds a-year; which they

they accepted of, not as a gift from the government, but as a part of that property of which they had been deprived: And notwithstanding the temptation they were laid under by this precarious support, they persisted in their loyalty, and publickly prayed in their churches for the king and his restoration.

These facts are appealed to by the Presbyterian ministers, in an address to the Duke of Ormond in 1662, when they were yet fresh in the memory of every one, and when all that generation could have refuted them, had they advanced any thing, that was not strictly true and of publick notoriety. What are the inferences to be drawn from these historical facts? or what stronger expressions of attachment could the most loyal subjects have shewn to their king and to the constitution? They preached and prayed for their king, asserted his title upon all occasions, pressed others to be loyal, refused to abjure him, were banished, reviled, sequestrated, imprisoned, miserably harassed and oppressed for him; faced the greatest dangers with fortitude not to be shaken, spoke and did what the ruling powers had decreed to be high-treason, and were not affrighted from their integrity by all the terrors of a military government, so formidable as to awe some of the greatest Crowned-heads in Europe, and to make foreign States court its alliance—and yet these are the men that have been charged with republican principles—have been called *levellers*, *Independents*,—and have been branded with disloyalty, according as it served the interest, or gratified the humour of those interested men, that chose to insult them.

They

They were no leſs active and zealous in promoting the Reſtoration; and none rejoiced more than they did at the revival of the ancient conſtitution. Could it have been expected that ſuch men, deſerving ſo well of their country and of the newly reſtored government, ſhould not have been themſelves reſtored to all their former privileges? —But it was not ſo....others reaped the reward of their ſufferings and their zeal....their miniſters were not reſtored to their livings.---Theſe were intercepted by the epiſcopal clergy, who came forward triumphant in thoſe *golden days* of the Church, and were not aſhamed to continue the oppreſſion of Cromwell againſt our fathers, by uſurping the tithes. The primacy was filled by a bigotted high churchman, who had been a creature of Laud, and had aſſiſted in his violent meaſures againſt the Preſbyterians:---ſevere laws were paſſed---the uſurpations of the epiſcopal clergy were confirmed; and they have continued to enjoy thoſe livings, which Preſbyterian miniſters had held from their firſt ſettlement in this kingdom, till they were ejected by Cromwell. However, after ſome years, Charles II. in conſideration of their ſufferings, and of their loyalty, and as a mark of attention and kindneſs, granted them a ſalary of 600l. a year to be divided among them. Though they had loſt their Tithes, and though this royal bounty fell ſo far ſhort of Cromwell's compoſition, yet they did not "ſound an alarm," as if the State was in danger. They received that mark of royal favour and protection with thankfulneſs, and the more ſo, as it originated with the king himſelf. He communicated his gracious purpoſe to the anceſtor of the Earls of Granard, Sir Arthur Forbes, who, from his knowledge of their principles

principles and conduct, and of the hardſhips they laboured under, encouraged his Majeſty in his intended munificence. Twelve hundred pounds were intended to have been given, but an accident intervened, that prevented, in part, his Majeſty's kindneſs.---But though their ſervices ſeemed to claim an ample reward, they were not reſtored to their former right in the tithes, nor even to Cromwell's compoſition.

Every one, acquainted with the tranſactions of thoſe times, knows how early and zealous the Preſbyterians were in the principles of the Revolution, and with how much vigour and activity they exerted themſelves, for accompliſhing and maintaining that happy event. Their miniſters were ſo forward in countenancing that glorious undertaking, that they ſent two of their number, commiſſioners to wait upon the prince of Orange, before he was proclaimed king, to congratulate him on his ſafe arrival, and to aſſure him of all the power of the Preſbyterians in Ireland in ſupport of his great enterprize; to which king William bears a moſt honourable teſtimony, in his letter dated at Hillſborough, 19th June, 1690, in the following words:—"Calling to mind how "early they were in their addreſs unto us, upon "our arrival in England; and the promiſes we "then made of a penſion---and being aſſured of "the peaceable and dutiful temper of our ſaid "ſubjects, and ſenſible of the loſſes they have "ſuſtained, and their conſtant labour to unite "the hearts of OTHERS in zeal and loyalty "towards us, &c." Here is a ſtriking contraſt between Preſbyterians and OTHERS, whom they wiſhed to reconcile to his Majeſty. It is plain,

plain, this could not refer to the Roman Catholicks, againſt whom other arms than perſuaſion were at that time neceſſary. His Majeſty had expreſſed himſelf in the like gracious manner in his letter to the Duke of Schomberg, dated 9th of November 1689, from Whitehall.---In theſe principles the great body of Preſbyterians in Britain and in Ireland were united; but in your Church, my Lord, it was far otherwiſe. There was a direct oppoſition of political principles in the members of the eſtabliſhed Church. Moderate Churchmen were the authors of the Revolution, and have been ever ſteady in ſupport of the civil conſtitution. They were an honour to their country, and to the Church of which they were members.---High Churchmen were the reverſe. They have been a diſhonour to their country, and have acted in violent oppoſition to the civil conſtitution. They have diſgraced their order: an opinion in which, I hope, all epiſcopals in this kingdom, at preſent, are agreed. We have the authority of a Biſhop in King William's reign, that "many of the clergymen had taken the oaths, "read the prayers for the preſent government, "and obſerved the order for public thankſgivings; and yet ſhewed in many places their "averſion to our eſtabliſhment but too viſibly.--- "This made many conclude, that the clergy "were a ſort of men, that would ſwear and pray, "even againſt their conſciences, rather than loſe "their benefices, and by conſequence that they "were governed by intereſt, not by principle. "This behaviour, it muſt be confeſſed, gave "atheiſts no ſmall advantage."*

* Burnet, Vol. II. p. 59.

This

This account refers to the conduct of the Engliſh Clergy; in Ireland they were no leſs inconſiſtent and divided; for proof of which it will be enough to refer to the ſpeech made by the Biſhop of Meath, in the name of the Clergy, to King James at the Caſtle of Dublin, and that made to King William at his camp near Dublin, July the 7th, 1690, which contain expreſſions of attachment and loyalty equally ſtrong, and in direct oppoſition to one another.

You tell us that King William "was induced "to yield to the ſuppreſſion of Prelacy in Scotland, "only by the oppoſition, which the Biſhops, attached to the houſe of Stuart, unanimouſly gave "to the proceedings in his favour."* This account would ſeem to confine the oppoſition to the Biſhops only; in which view, it is very defective. For a Scotch epiſcopal and biſhop informs us, "that King William could not hinder the change "of the government of the Church of Scotland to "Preſbyteries, without putting all his affairs into "great diſorder. The epiſcopal party went *almoſt* "*univerſally* into King James's intereſts: ſo that "the Preſbyterians were the only party that the "king had in that kingdom."† If this be added to the account you have given---it will be more full, but not more to the honour of Prelacy, as to its influence on the ſtate, "conſidered in a point of "view merely political."

Let us not deceive ourſelves, my Lord; let not the nation be deceived. Epiſcopacy gives no title

* P. 13. † Burnet, Vol. II. p. 17.

to

to ſuperior confidence in the ſtate---your order is not remarkable for conſiſtency---Hiſtory will juſtify no ſuch claim; nor will you be able to prove that you are the only "cordial friends of the ſtate, "that can be truſted in perfect conſiſtency of "principle." Let me not bring an indiſcriminate charge againſt the members of your church. *Some* of them were men of generous and noble principles. With them the Preſbyterians united *in a body*, concerted meaſures for putting this kingdom into a poſture of defence, aſſerted the liberties of their country, and ſaved this kingdom to the Crown of England, by their matchleſs valour in defending Derry and Enniſkillen. And yet in this very reign the high churchmen deſcribed above reviled and haraſſed thoſe illuſtrious defenders of their country as enemies of the ſtate, and unworthy of enjoying a liberal toleration—and within a few years, a very few years, in the beginning of the ſucceeding reign, when theſe heroes had ſcarcely taught their children the ſtory of their fame, and told their liſtening neighbours the adventurous deeds of their proweſs and hardihood, theſe illuſtrious defenders of Derry and Enniſkillen beheld with indignation, that they were rendered by law * incapable of ſerving that country, which they had juſt ſaved to the crown, and defended with ſuch diſtinguiſhed honour and gallantry. This invidious and diſhonourable law was promoted by thoſe men, whom they had endeavoured in vain to unite in affection to King William. This was their crime, and it could not be forgiven. It purſued them throughout Queen

* Teſt-Act, 2 Anne, c. 6.

Anne's

Anne's reign, and towards the end of it brought down upon them the reſentment of the convocation, in a memorial to the Queen, expreſſed with much ſeverity. The opportunity was well choſen. The miniſtry knew their ſchemes would no where meet with more determined oppoſition, than from the Preſbyterians. Their violence therefore correſponded with the violence of the clergy—and they received their invectives gladly. The times were big with danger. The nation was agitated with anxious apprehenſion, torn in pieces by faction and party; and every thing threatened to involve this devoted country, again, in all the horrors of a civil war. But this cloud, fraught with ſo much miſchief and horror, was happily diſpelled by the death of the Queen, and peace and happineſs reſtored by the acceſſion of the preſent Royal Family to the throne; an event in which none did more zealouſly concur than Preſbyterians, and in which none had greater reaſon to rejoice. In the reign of George I. they obtained an act of toleration on very liberal principles, and in the reign of his preſent Majeſty, the Teſt-Act has been repealed, which was ſo long a diſgrace to our Statute-Book, and diſhonourable to the nation. It may be added, that in the reign of both theſe princes, the Preſbyterian miniſters received an augmentation of the royal bounty.

From this account you will obſerve, my Lord, that the eſtabliſhment of the Preſbyterians in Ireland was of a peculiar kind: that they were not Diſſenters from your Church, more than you were Diſſenters from them; that they made no rent or breach in your church, of which they were never

members, except by a comprehenſion, which ſhould ever be deſirable to liberal minds. And, I apprehend, it will be very difficult for you to point out, on juſt principles of policy in this kingdom, what the reaſons of ſtate are, that ſhould exalt the epiſcopal church ſo very high, and depreſs the Preſbyterian church ſo very low. For it may be obſerved,

1. That they were not ſo originally.....The Preſbyterians having ſettled in Ulſter by an encouragement of government, on a fair and equal footing, as we have ſeen, ſo far as the difference of their church diſcipline permitted.

2. That in eſtabliſhing their church they had peculiar privileges—that theſe privileges they never forfeited to the ſtate; but that they were torn from them by thoſe men, who overturned the conſtitution.

3. That from the nature of their firſt eſtabliſhment, they have not only a right to a toleration, in common with other good ſubjects, but have a claim on the ſtate for ſupport and protection; and that this claim is ſtrengthened by the manner, in which they loſt the privileges and emoluments of their church.

4. That they were invited here to ſtrengthen the hands of government, and to ſupport the conſtitution; and that for this end, the whole body of Preſbyterians was firmly united;—but that the eſtabliſhed church was not thus united, many of its members being violent in their oppoſition to

King

King William, and to the Hanover ſucceſſion; of which a thouſand proofs might be adduced, beſides thoſe already offered. You may judge, therefore, what degree of credit is due, or is likely to be given to that confident boaſting, where it is ſaid, "the eſtabliſhed clergy of this kingdom may "with confidence appeal to government, and to "their fellow-ſubjects, for their zeal for the con-"ſtitution, as well as for that example of a duti-"ful and orderly demeanour, which they uni-"formly have ſet to their pariſhioners, in the moſt "*diſorderly* and *factious* times;"* and whether it be *malice to contradict it.*

5. That the principles and conduct of Preſbyterians are no leſs ſtrongly marked by the ill treatment they have received, than by the protection they have met with; as they have been always perſecuted by the Tories, and always protected by the Whigs, and moderate church-men. Thoſe illuſtrious characters, who were an honour to the nation, and the church of which they were members, who took the moſt diſtinguiſhed part in thoſe great events, the Revolution and the acceſſion of the houſe of Hanover, conſidered the Preſbyterians as a ſteady and determined ſet of men, whom they could truſt with entire confidence, and in oppoſition to your opinion, looked upon them as "cordial friends of the conſtitution in moſt per-"fect conſiſtency of principle."

But if you ſtill perſiſt, that members of the eſtabliſhed church alone can be "cordial friends of "the ſtate, we might reply, that during the

* p. 39.

" *comprehenſion* of the two churches, Preſbyteri-
" ans were cordial friends."—If a change has happened, by whoſe miſconduct has it happened?—our loyalty is untainted.....therefore, as a political man, you ſhould plead for a reſtoration of our original rights and privileges. Your principles narrow the foundation of allegiance. That generous and exalted ſentiment, the love of our country, which has formed the patriot and hero in every age, is thereby debaſed, and ſunk in the fanciful or intereſted notions of eccleſiaſticks.

But, if your principle is ſtill to be maintained, the queſtion might be brought to another iſſue. And I would then refer to your conſideration the opinion of the preſent archdeacon of Carliſle. In his book, which you have quoted with approbation, he lays it down that the eſtabliſhed church ſhould conſiſt of the ſect, that is moſt numerous. Now as Preſbyterians would maintain the Proteſtant aſcendency, and as they out-number your church ſo very far, they ought to form the eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment, and then they might be truſted with perfect conſiſtency of principle. And as the ſtrength of a nation conſiſts in the number of inhabitants; and the ſtability of government is in proportion to the number of ſubjects, that are to be truſted with the moſt perfect confidence, then, I ſuppoſe, my Lord, you will think it a mark of wiſdom in government to adopt this idea, how much ſoever it may hurt your particular intereſt. But for the diſcuſſion of this ſubject, I will refer you to the learned archdeacon, who will be able, I truſt, to defend his opinion in our favour—You will obſerve alſo, that this opinion is in direct oppoſition to your favourite notion of an *eſſential* union

on between your particular eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment, and our civil conſtitution.

Preſbyterians, moſt unqueſtionably, think your eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment is in no ſort eſſential to the exiſtence of the ſtate—*non tali auxilio, nec defenſoribus iſtis*, as you expreſs yourſelf on another occaſion. Our conſtitution would be feeble indeed, if its exiſtence depended either on your, or our church government, or on any other particular form of church polity. The Lord Abbots loſt their ſeats in parliament; the ſtate was not weakened or convulſed—the effect would be the ſame, if the lord biſhops were reſtored to primitive epiſcopacy. Church-men, of whatever denomination, ſhould, as a body, have no political exiſtence. Wherever ſuch eccleſiaſtical polity has been eſtabliſhed, it has, by working on the ſuperſtitious weakneſs and folly of mankind, produced the moſt unhappy effects, and has ever been a ready "engine of "ſtate," in the hands of intereſted, ambitious men; and in this judgment we are confirmed by the authority of an Engliſh Parliament.

You call upon Preſbyterians in a very alarming tone to turn their attention to the preſent danger of your eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment. "They can have nothing before them, but an option of the aſcendency of either the church of Ireland, or of Rome."* But why ſhould they not? they were originally *comprehended* in the church of Ireland; and, if the ſafety of the ſtate depends upon it, why might they not be reſtored to their firſt privileges? You tell them however, that "their ſituation cannot be

* p. 78.

" improved."....How far that may, or may not be ſo, will depend upon government. To government they have been obliged for the freedom of religion they have experienced; but from the hiſtorical facts before produced, they cannot be thought to have any great obligations to your eſtabliſhed church. For, if conſiderations of policy had not induced government to reſtrain the violence of high-churchmen in this kingdom, there is little reaſon to think that the perſecutions would have been leſs cruel here than in Scotland, in the reigns of Charles II. and James II. If you will compare the hiſtory of theſe perſecutions of Proteſtant Biſhops with the perſecutions of Lewis XIV. you will have little reaſon to boaſt of the ſpirit of your hierarchy.* I mention not theſe things from any invidious purpoſe of reviving the memory of paſt tranſactions, which you, my Lord, and every liberal minded man muſt ſo highly diſapprove; but to ſhew the ill effects which this conſtitution is capable of producing, and that, in the hands of arbitrary princes, it is as fit an engine of tyranny, as you have repreſented the Popiſh hierarchy to be.

* Whether we aſcribe perſecution to eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhments, conſidered in a political or religious view, it is contended that all ſects, when in power, have been guilty of perſecution. This is a levelling principle, and is a faſhionable one; it decides readily, without the trouble of inquiry, and aſſumes the appearance of hiſtorical knowledge and candour: Though there is reaſon to think that it is ſometimes uſed to evade difficulties, with which the perſon feels himſelf entangled, and cannot otherwiſe get rid of. But the Preſbyterians of Scotland and Ireland call upon their adverſaries to produce one inſtance of any man being fined, impriſoned, ſet in a pillory, loſing his ears, ſuffering torture or death, becauſe of his departing from their confeſſion of faith. See preface to the Confeſſion.

But

But you go on to tell them; "how much "*their* ſituation may be changed for the worſe, "under the Church of Rome, it behoves them "to conſider with attention, and without delay; "as the conduct of ſo numerous and reſpectable "a body may decide the event."* If, indeed, the interpoſition of Preſbyterians be ſo deciſive in this critical moment, it is ſomewhat extraordinary, that you have pointed out no ſcheme for them to purſue. If they purſue their own principles, as you have deſcribed them, they would only precipitate the "fatal moment:" for according to you, they would be led away by a "fairy viſion." When you call for their ſupport, if you wiſhed for it, they might have expected you would have propoſed ſome plan dictated by experience and wiſdom. But they are left in the dark, and know not in what manner they may moſt effectually co-operate with your views for the publick ſafety. Would you have them addreſs parliament, and aſſure them that the nation is wrong in conſidering tithes as a tax on induſtry, and a grievance: or would you have them muſter their Volunteers, and march to Cloyne to protect the clergy, and their tithe farmers? or ſhould they allow the laymen of your own Church to take the lead, and then follow their deciſions implicitly, whether for the continuance of tithes, or for a commutation? or will it be ſtill better to wait the deliberations of government; and will it be ſoon enough to give their opinion, or to act, when they ſhall be called on by parliament?

In all arduous matters, where the ſafety of

* Ibid.

the

the State was concerned, they preſume they have never been wanting in their duty. But, the preſent caſe appears to them in a very different point of view. They are confident that the wiſdom and ſtrength of government are more than equal to quiet the object of your fears, and ſettle the maintenance of the clergy in ſuch a manner, as to promote the intereſt and happineſs of the kingdom.

Thus, my Lord, I have made ſuch obſervations, as ſeemed neceſſary to aſſert the dignity of our civil conſtitution, and its independence on the eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment, conſidered "in a poli-"tical view," and alſo to wipe off the foul aſperſions thrown on the Preſbyterians of Ireland, whoſe *conduct*, it is acknowledged, gave no cauſe for this unprovoked attack. You are called upon, my Lord, to reconſider this ſubject; and if you would defend what you have aſſerted, it is expected you will explain, particularly, what you mean by the *levelling* and *independent* principles of Preſbyterians; "that you will adduce facts of ſo ge-"neral a nature as to ſupport political conclu-"ſions;"* and from thence ſhew, *why* Preſbyterians may not be truſted as good ſubjects, and with perfect confidence. An argument that may involve the happineſs of thouſands ſhould not be lightly taken up—nor a charge be brought againſt them founded on fancy or prejudice, or ſuperficial information—and therefore it is, my Lord, that you, who neither want abilities, nor inclination, are called upon in this publick manner, to bring forward a particular, explicit charge, ſupported by hiſtorical evidence, to ſhew in what inſtances

* p. 40.

they

they have acted againſt the liberties, or intereſt of their country. Here is a large range propoſed to your conſideration, a period of near two centuries, abounding with the moſt intereſting events, and the various fortune of contending parties, in which the conſtitution ſuffered the moſt dreadful convulſions, and was at length reſtored by the virtue and by the valour of her citizens. In this eventful period, where the principles and fortitude of men were put to the ſevereſt trial, we do not heſitate to challenge a compariſon between the members of our church and yours, not from oſtentation, but compelled by the neceſſity you have laid us under to ſupport our character in the moſt open manner, and being perſuaded that the more our conduct is examined, it will redound the more to our reputation and honour, as the ſteady and determined friends of our ſo juſtly admired conſtitution.

In the mean while, you are to conſider, whether there may not be reaſon to apprehend, that your book may have injured them in the opinion of men, who have acceſs to government and to our gracious ſovereign; and that ſuch unfavourable impreſſions may operate hereafter to the diſadvantage of a very numerous and reſpectable body of loyal ſubjects. Should this happen, it is your duty to conſider how your conduct may be defended. Others may think it highly criminal. I may be thought too much intereſted to give an opinion. I will therefore ſubmit to your conſideration in a caſe ſomewhat ſimilar the judgment of an author of no mean authority, Monteſquieu *, who cannot be thought partial—and ſo bid you heartily farewell. " Il eſt accuſé d'un grand crime: c'etoit d'avoir

* Lett. Perſan. tom II. p. 120.

d'avoir calomnié la *nation*; & de lui avoir fait perdre la confiance de son Roi: forfait, qui, selon moi, merite mille morts.

" Car enfin, si c'est une mauvaise action de noircir dans l'esprit du Prince le dernier de ses sujets: qu'est-ce, lorsque l'on noirci la nation entiere, & qu'on lui ote la bienveillance de celui que la Providence a établi pour faire son bonheur."

I have the honour to be,

My Lord, with all due regard,

Your Lordship's

most obedient and

most humble servant,

WILLIAM CAMPBELL.

Armagh,
January 25th, 1787.